THE REFORMATION AND THE PEOPLE

T. A. LACEY

ANGLICAN LIBRARY OF FAITH & THOUGHT

Class 283.04 S Book L116
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by
EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.
DEAN 1879-1902

ANGLICAN LIBRARY OF FAITH AND THOUGHT

Edited by LEONARD PRESTIGE, B.D.
Rector of Upper Heyford, Oxon.

THE REFORMATION AND THE PEOPLE

THE
ANGLICAN LIBRARY OF FAITH AND THOUGHT

Edited by
THE REV. LEONARD PRESTIGE

Crown 8vo.
Paper Covers, 2*s*. 6*d*. net. Cloth 4*s*. net.

CHRISTIAN RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE
By the Right Rev. ARTHUR CHANDLER, Rector of Bentley, Farnham, Surrey, formerly Bishop of Bloemfontein.

DIVINE PROVIDENCE
By the Rev. CHARLES J. SHEBBEARE, M.A., Rector of Stanhope, Durham, Chaplain to H.M. the King.

THE REFORMATION AND THE PEOPLE
By the Rev. THOMAS A. LACEY, M.A., D.D., F.S.A., Canon of Worcester.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO. LTD.
LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO,
CALCUTTA, BOMBAY, MADRAS

THE REFORMATION AND THE PEOPLE

BY

T. A. LACEY, D.D.

CANON OF WORCESTER

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
LONDON ▫ NEW YORK ▫ TORONTO
1929

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO. LTD.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.4
6 OLD COURT HOUSE STREET, CALCUTTA
53 NICOL ROAD, BOMBAY
167 MOUNT ROAD, MADRAS

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
55 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
221 EAST 20TH STREET, CHICAGO
TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON
128-132 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, TORONTO

283.04 S
L116
87957

Made in Great Britain

EDITORIAL FOREWORD

A FEW words seem desirable to explain the publication of a series of books, some of which may appear to differ widely in character from others, under the common title of the Anglican Library of Faith and Thought. The general intention is to offer a systematic treatment of some of the facts of religious experience and history, in such a manner as to illustrate the principles involved or implied in them. The authors invited to contribute to this series are men of thought, who would all attach a high value to the historical continuity and intellectual tradition of the Christian Church, but are at the same time fully conscious of the need for independent judgment and for sympathetic understanding of modern problems and processes. The books are not technical handbooks, but aim at presenting facts intelligently to the educated public, without any sacrifice of interest and attractiveness.

It should be said that the original suggestion of the series was made by the Literature Committee of the English Church Union, a body of some fifty well-known scholars of the Anglican Communion. But the Union assumes no responsibility for any more than the projection of the series and the appointment, jointly with Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co., of the Editor. Detailed responsibility rests entirely with the several authors, subject only to the Editor's general oversight ; and that oversight has been exercised of set purpose with a view to the production of works which in the Editor's judgment are of value in tending to promote clear thought upon important subjects, rather than with a view to obtaining finality of statement

upon matters in which a claim to finality might possibly savour of intellectual presumption.

The Editor ventures to express the hope that when its purpose is understood in this sense the series may prove of real value in a generation which from its various circumstances both needs and demands clear and serious thinking about the fundamental concerns of religion.

G.L.P.

PREFACE

A READER of this book will have no difficulty in perceiving that it is concerned mainly with the fortunes of the Reformation in England. But the beginnings must be studied. It is important to bear in mind that England and the English people made no original contribution to the movement, which was throughout foreign to this country, and began to impress our people only at a rather late stage of its development. I hope to convince my readers, if they have any doubt of it, that the one master-mind of the Reformation was Calvin's. I hope also to make plain the essential meaning of Calvinism, and to disentangle what has been accidental in its presentment. Some things have become clearer to me while engaged on the task. The intensive reading required for the production of this small book has convinced me that certain features of the system which had seemed to be adventitious were contained in it from the first, and conversely that Calvin himself was cramped by the conditions of life at Geneva, and could not bring the system to its perfect form except in the wider liberty afforded by the contentious circumstances of France.

That the Reformation which came so late to England was never thoroughly assimilated, is plain matter of fact. That the Movement which began with high aspirations had many sordid passages, and ended in tragedy, seems to me beyond dispute. I cannot expect to carry all readers with me to this conclusion ; but I ask those who will not follow me so far to observe that I think the conclusion lamentable, and that I add an epilogue of hope.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	THE BEGINNING	1
II.	CALVIN	14
III.	CALVINISM	20
IV.	ENGLAND UNDER HENRY VIII	35
V.	ACTION AND REACTION	48
VI.	THE ELIZABETHAN SETTLEMENT	61
VII.	THE RECUSANTS	76
VIII.	THE PURITANS	93
IX.	THE CONFORMISTS	108
	EPILOGUE	116

CHAPTER I

THE BEGINNING

IN the reading of general history, the Reformation appears as the work of certain outstanding personages, of prelates, princes and magistrates, with their subordinate ministers. A legislature occasionally intervenes, but it is usually under strict control. Popular movements sometimes appear on the scene, raising conflagrations which with few exceptions are quenched in blood; penetrating streams of influence may flow from them, but they seem to leave hardly any mark on the general course of events. One of the earliest results of Luther's agitation was the assertion of a right vested in every Prince of the Empire to reform the Church within his dominions.[1] Rudolph Sohm has laboured to show that this did not involve any exercise of authority within the Church, but was only a power of police brought to bear upon the Church from without, enjoyed no less by Catholic than by Protestant Princes. It is true that the principle, *cuius regio eius religio*, cut both ways, and until after the Peace of Westphalia, Catholic Princes forced Catholicism upon the Protestant populations of territory which they had acquired; it is true also that within the Church as conceived by Luther himself there was no room for any kind of coercive jurisdiction; but none the less, while a Catholic Prince was constrained to observe the established order of the Church, the Reformation throughout Germany was ordered at will by the Princes and the Free Cities within their several dominions.

The Prince was very soon recognised in effect and in style

[1] *Reformationsgewalt* or *ius reformandi*. Rudolph Sohm, *Kirchengeschichte im Grundriss*, p. 147 (13th Ed.).

as the supreme authority, *summus episcopus*, within the Church ; a novelty which was perhaps the less difficult of digestion because there were many Bishops and Abbots, Princes themselves, whose spiritual and temporal functions were not easily distinguished.

Some of them, indeed, accepted the Reformation, laid aside their spiritual character, and succeeded in retaining the Church lands as hereditary lay fiefs. The most remarkable convert of this kind is found, however, beyond the borders of the Empire. Albrecht of Brandenburg, Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights, embraced the Lutheran doctrines, married, persuaded his knights and junkers to do likewise, and transformed the lands of the Order into the Duchy of Prussia, held nominally of the Crown of Poland. A similar attempt was perhaps contemplated by Hermann of Wied, Archbishop and Elector of Cologne. This was more serious, for his defection would destroy the Catholic majority in the Electoral College, and Charles V might be succeeded by a Protestant Emperor. He was therefore strenuously resisted. His Chapter rejected the reformed Liturgy which he tried to impose on them ; the citizens of Cologne were equally hostile ; and, with the support of the Emperor, the Pope Paul III effectively deposed him from his See. He is remembered chiefly through Cranmer's borrowings from him for the English Prayer Book. Stranger things occurred where a bishopric was filled alternately by an elected ecclesiastic and by a member of some princely family. George I of England had in his boyhood been Bishop of Osnabrück, and the second son of George III under the same title commanded his father's army in Flanders. After the Peace of Westphalia these intrusive rulers no longer controlled the conscience of the subject, but in the earlier years of the Reformation it was within the Empire an established principle that the Prince ruled in matters of religion. The principle extended beyond Germany with the spreading of Lutheranism ; in Denmark and Sweden, not without resistance. It reached England also, but with a difference.

Inconsistent with all this appear the accusations of promoting political and social unrest brought against Luther at the Diet of Worms. They were true in fact, though probably contrary from the first to his intention. His advocacy of religious freedom and his whole doctrine of the Church as a loose aggregation of faithful believers inevitably had the predicted result in a period when a clear distinction of Church and State was unknown. His vivid and passionate tracts in the vulgar tongue were circulated and eagerly read throughout Germany ; all the turbulent elements of society, which abounded in the Middle Ages as much as at any other time, fastened upon them. In most of the cities there was a strong social organisation capable of dealing with disorder, but in rural districts the scattered knightly families had no such advantage. The *Bundschuh*, a secret fraternity which had for emblem the peasant's clog, had for many years made itself felt in sporadic risings, and Luther had not hesitated to warn princes and prelates of what it might do unless restrained by the evangelic religion which he was teaching. The warning was interpreted as a threat, and agitators were in fact turning his denunciation of abuses into an armoury of revolt. The great rising of 1525 closely resembled the English insurrection of the year 1381, and was about as much related to Luther's teaching as that to Wycliff's ; Münzer, its most violent leader, may indeed have derived something from the English source, for he had relations with the militant Hussites of Bohemia.

At the first onset Luther condemned the rising as rebellion, but declared it a judgment of God on Princes and Prelates for their opposition to his teaching. His tone was soon changed. Genuinely shocked by the excesses of the movement, and seeing how gravely it affected the prospects of religious reformation, he turned upon the insurgents with a savagery equal to their own, and called upon the princes to put them down with relentless bloodshed. It was done, and the first popular reaction to the preaching of the Reformation came to nothing. The peril brought all the

princes together in a temper of compromise; and at the Diet of Speier in 1526 the *Reformationsgewalt* was formally established as law for the Kingdom of Germany, if not for the whole Empire. "Luther in fact saved the Reformation," says Professor Pollard, "by cutting it adrift from the failing cause of the peasants and tying it to the chariot wheels of the triumphant Princes."[1]

The next three years witnessed one of the periodic collapses of the Papacy. With its accustomed power of recuperation it had emerged with renewed strength from the disorder of the Great Schism and the humiliations of the Council of Constance. Martin V, the creature of the Council, at once revived all the papal claims which it had laboured to moderate. His successor, Eugenius IV, flouted the Council of Basel, which attempted a continuation of that work, and the Conciliar Movement ended in abject failure. Followed the twelve, called with good reason the Renaissance Popes; they revived the temporal glories of Rome and let down the Papal Court to a moral abasement rivalling that of the tenth century, which left its hold on the government of the Church strangely unaffected, but certainly contributed to the revolt of the Reformation. The brief episode of Adrian VI served only to show how impossible was any internal reform of the Curia. His successor, Clement VII, witnessed in 1527 the sack of Rome by the riff-raff of an imperial army, including thousands of Lutheran *Landsknechten*, and became the submissive instrument of Charles the Fifth. For the first time since the days of the great Saxons a Roman emperor, now rather Spanish than German, found himself undisputed master of Italy. Equally strong for the time in Germany, he induced the Diet of Speier in 1529 to reverse the legislation of 1526, when a small minority of princes and cities registered the famous Protest which gave a name to their party, and ultimately to all the elements of Western Christendom ranged against the Papacy. The Protestant units insisted

[1] *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. II, p. 194.

on their right to control religion, and Luther made the timely discovery that Charles, despite his title, was not the Cæsar of the New Testament, but what we should now call a constitutional monarch. To curb his power, princes and cities formed the Schmalkaldic League, the beginning of a movement which was to break up the German kingdom into a loose bundle of independent states. Its ostensible object was only to protect the Protestants in their own territories, to which end it sought foreign alliances with the Emperor's personal enemies, and Luther so clung to his doctrine of passive obedience as to discourage attempts to secure even toleration for individual Protestants under Catholic rulers. For ten years the League maintained a precarious peace, during which the Anabaptists of Münster were crushed by the joint efforts of both parties ; but then broke out the first of the Wars of Religion which desolated central Europe until general exhaustion imposed the Peace of Westphalia. During that long misery the marvel is that the common people retained any regard for the religion imposed on them this way or that, which was the cause of their wretchedness.

The three great centres of volcanic activity, in Saxony, in German-Switzerland, and in the City of Geneva, differing in many respects, agreed in this result. Huldreich Zwingli was a reformer before Luther, and of a more traditional type, a humanist and a professed disciple of Erasmus. Unlike Luther, he had a good position in the hierarchy ; a priest of loose life, as he openly confessed, but learned and temperamentally averse from all kinds of superstition, he was early in the field against the abuse of Indulgences. His intimate association with Cardinal Schinner, the great Bishop of Sion and ally of Julius II, brought him into relations with the Papal Court, of which he became a pensioner, and he vigorously supported the participation of the Swiss Confederates in the wars of Italy. The great defeat of Marignano in 1515, at which he was present, produced in him, as in some others, a revulsion from these

adventures, and as early as the year 1517, he seems to have come to the conclusion that the Papacy was doomed. Of the Papacy as a military power in Italy his forecast was correct, and with that side of its activities he had been closely associated. What more he had in mind may perhaps be inferred from his subsequent conduct. In 1518 he was elected by the Chapter of the Great Church at Zurich to the pastoral charge of the city, and soon began his memorable career as Reformer.

The civil and ecclesiastical constitution of the city determined his course of action. Belonging to the diocese of Constance, the Great Church enjoyed considerable exemption from episcopal control. The city acknowledged no lord, having long since secured independence in alliance with the Swiss Cantons, its neighbours. These two separate powers might well have been engaged in the familiar feud of spiritualty and temporalty, but the great Burgomaster Hans Waldmann had in the later years of the fifteenth century asserted the jurisdiction of the City over the Church, and in the year 1510 Julius II confirmed the powers so claimed in pursuance of his policy of close alliance with the Confederates. This made reform easy. The political form of the city approached democracy, and there was unquestionably a fervid popular response to Zwingli's preaching ; but the work was done by the Gilds and the Great Council. The jurisdiction of the distant bishop was repudiated, and carried away with it the hardly more distant authority of the Court of Rome, with which indeed Zurich had close and mutually profitable relations. The Chapter was soon dissolved, the revenues of the prebends being appropriated to educational and charitable uses. Here the Zurichers were partly in the fashion, for their neighbour, Ferdinand of Austria, the Emperor's brother, was busily annexing ecclesiastical endowments for his more wasteful but necessary expenditure on protracted war with the encroaching Turk. The out-lying villages dependent on the city were rapidly evangelized, partly by the eloquence of the

preacher, partly by the unstinted pressure of the magistracy.

Zwingli's activity was immense and varied. In 1524 he gave a lead to Luther by publicly marrying the lady with whom he had been living, like many other priests of the time, in tolerated concubinage. His daughter he gave in marriage to Heinrich Bullinger, afterwards his successor in leadership and a notable adviser of English Reformers. His influence extended beyond its principal seat. One half of the Canton of Glarus, in which he had been a parish priest, adopted his scheme of Reform. The Patricians of Bern moulded it to suit their civic policy, and imposed it with some difficulty on their subjects in the valleys of the Oberland ; at a later date they drove out the Bishop of Lausanne, effecting a forced conversion of the Pays de Vaud and of the Chablais beyond the Lake of Leman ; these spiritual and material conquests were afterwards shared with the Duke of Savoy, and the piety of St. François de Sales restored the Chablais to the Roman fold. Their nearer neighbours of Freiburg were more warlike, and remained Catholic. Basel, politically emancipated from its Bishop, banished him to his principality in the Jura, now annexed to Bern but still invincibly Catholic ; after some tumults which drove Erasmus the peace-lover back to the Netherlands, the magistrates established in the city and banlieue a Church sufficiently characterised by the seats of authority which their successors still occupy around the Holy Table in the ancient cathedral. Zwingli inspired the whole movement. Nor did he move only the Swiss Confederates and their allies ; his influence extended far among the towns of southern Germany. The Bishop of Strassburg was treated like his brother of Basel, and under the guidance of Martin Bucer the city became almost a second Zurich. Contact with Lutheranism meant conflict. Philip of Hessen, the most politic of Reformers, called a conference at Marburg, to which Zwingli came in person, meeting Luther face to face. His sacramental teaching was rejected with horror, and Bucer's attempted compromise had no success. Already

in the year 1529, the Saxon and the Helvetic Reformers finally parted company.

Where were the common people in all this turmoil of princes and magistrates, preachers and professors ? Luther assigned them no part but that of passive obedience. Zwingli exhorted them to read the Bible and think for themselves, but would not let them translate thought into action. We are not concerned for our present purpose with any of his special teaching except his doctrine of the Church. Affecting the part of the prophet, he was by nature a political organiser ; he had no use for Luther's Invisible Church, seeing clearly that the Body of Christ must be a recognisable society. It was, in fact, the whole company of Believers, in which all were of equal standing, except as some were marked by spiritual gifts for spiritual leadership. It is obvious that a purely democratic constitution of a purely voluntary association was indicated. The seed thus sown was in the long run to produce a luxuriant harvest, but Zwingli would not reap even the first-fruits. His temper was aristocratic and arbitrary. His practical contempt for the democracy which he theoretically taught appears in some of his prominent actions.

There were at Zurich, from the first, radical reformers who took him at his word. From premises supplied by him, some of them concluded that the baptism of infants was contrary to the Word of God, a profane ceremony ; converts from the popish religion who had received this mockery of a Christian sacrament must be baptized on their adhesion to the Gospel, and the children of true believers also must wait for maturity before receiving baptism. Hence the name of " Anabaptist " was fastened upon them : a misleading designation, since this practice was but an incidental accompaniment of apocalyptic dreams touching the whole of human life. It was, however, a distinguishing mark, and Zwingli resolved to use it for striking at them. He induced the Great Council to decree the banishment of all citizens whose children were

not baptized. The exiles gathered to themselves fanatical elements which abounded in Germany, and within ten years produced the atrocities of Münster, but Zurich was purged of them. So far Zwingli acted consistently, but the Council was exposed to currents of opinion, and a more manageable organ was needed. A committee of six officials known as the *Heimliche Rat*, savouring rather of the Venetian constitution than of Swiss freedom, was formed to deal with a difficult problem, and speedily gathered into its hands the administration of the city. During the brief remainder of his life Zwingli became, with the help of this instrument, all but Dictator alike in spiritual and temporal affairs.

Not less characteristic was his treatment of the genuine democracies of the Swiss Confederation that flourished in the immediate neighbourhood. The Forest Cantons resolutely refused to have any part in his reforms, and excluded his preachers from their territory. After many attempts to overcome their resistance, the Secret Council resolved in 1529 to effect this by force. The Cantons took up arms to meet the attack openly threatened, and a civil war that might have rent the Confederation would have ensued but for the mediation of Glarus and Bern. A treaty of peace was signed at Kappel, by which Zurich obtained great advantages, since the Forest Cantons agreed to renounce an alliance recently concluded with Ferdinand as Archduke of Austria, who was meditating hostile action against the Reformers, while Zurich retained the right to contract countervailing alliances. It was also agreed that no coercion should be used against the Forest Cantons in matters of religion. Two years later the Zurichers demanded permission to send preachers under safe-conduct into the cantons, and in concert with Bern imposed a close blockade until this should be granted. Reduced to severe straits, the Forest Cantons and the associated City of Luzern again took up arms, and invaded the territory of Zurich with a force of eight thousand men, which inflicted an overwhelming defeat on a hastily assembled army of inferior

numbers ; in the ensuing rout Zwingli was slain. This battle of Kappel, fought on October 11th, 1531, was the end of the military dominance of Zurich.

Equally aggressive, and more successful, was the pressure put by the Reformers on the districts of Aargau and Thurgau. Delivered by the Swiss from their feudal lords, these lands were not organized as members of the Confederation, but were subject to the Federal Diet, and each was administered by a higher and a lower magistrate, the former appointed by the Diet, in which the Catholics had a permanent majority, the latter by one of the Federated Cantons and Cities in turn. To which of these magistrates the control of religion belonged was a debated point, but nominees of Zurich backed by the Secret Council took the matter into their own hands, and prevented the entry of successors nominated by Unterwalden. The dispute was settled by the Peace of Kappel on reasonable terms ; there should be no persecution, and in each parish a majority of the inhabitants should decide to what form of religion they would adhere. The subsequent weakening of Zurich prevented further aggression, and there seems to have been a genuine popular movement which carried most of the parishes into the way of the Reformed.

After the battle of Kappel the militancy of the Reformation died down, and religion became curiously stabilized throughout the Confederation, presenting features familiar in our day, adjacent villages being immovably Catholic or Reformed. At this critical moment the city of Geneva became an ally first of Bern and then of the whole Confederation. With the exception of Neufchâtel and the Bishopric of Basel, now the Bernese Jura, the limits of the loose federal union known as Switzerland were settled approximately as they are at present. Within them there was a religious truce, at least, if not peace, and the beginning of a mutual toleration elsewhere unknown. The frequent civil wars on a petty scale which vexed the country until the middle of the nineteenth century were seldom without some

complication of religious jealousies, but there was no longer any definite war of religion. The rigid enforcement of religious uniformity in each several canton broke down with increasing intercommunication, and mutual toleration of communities paved the way for individual toleration. If toleration means a weakening of religious distinctions, there is little evidence of it in modern Switzerland ; if it means the patient endurance of what you detest at your very doors, it is there firmly established.

Zurich, its truculence abated, acquired under the guidance of Heinrich Bullinger a better reputation as the intellectual metropolis of the Reformed. When the faint whispers of such reformation had been silenced in Italy, disciples of Juan de Valdés such as Pietro-Martire Vermigli and the Socini found a refuge there, and issued thence to new fields of action. As early as 1538, an otherwise unknown correspondent is found writing to Bullinger from Maidstone, and soon afterwards a group of four Englishmen seems to have been either studying under him or intending so to do.[1] Peaceful penetration extended far, when violence could not reach even to the Lake of Luzern. In 1536 a great concourse of delegates from all the Reformed Cantons composed a brief statement of their teaching, which formed the basis of the great *Confessio Helvetica*. This was the last attempt at concord with the Saxon Reformers, and tempered Zwingli's doctrine by insisting that sacraments are not " bare signs " but signs and realities in one ; " signis simul et rebus constant." Luther was not satisfied, and he was probably no better pleased with the firm teaching of the Swiss about the Church. His " Invisible Church " was recognized as " known only to the eyes of God," but with bold inconsistency was described as so founded by Christ's ordinance in external ordinances, that without these no man, apart from some special divine privilege, can be recognized as belonging to it.[2] The community of believers was thus

[1] Burnet, *Hist. Ref.*, III, pp. 132, 140, and Pocock's notes.
[2] *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 108. " Cum solius Dei oculis sit nota,

identified with the true Church of Christ. This community was to be administered only by such persons as should be chosen by the Church and confirmed in office "manuum sacerdotis impositione"—a notable phrase to issue from such a source.

There is a remarkable departure both from Luther and from Zwingli in the treatment of the Civil Magistrate. He is said, in St. Paul's language, to be "of God," but his relation to the Church is defined as external and beneficent; his chief functions are to repress blasphemy, and to promote the "pure and free preaching of the Word," the instruction of old and young, the liberal maintenance of the Church's ministers, and a sedulous care for the poor. In the second place his duty is to administer justice, to maintain the public peace, and to punish evil doers. Among these last are included dissenters, *ab ecclesiæ sancta societate dissidentes*, whom he is to coerce, by means unspecified. To the Magistrate thus constituted the authors of the Confession tender a voluntary promise—"free though we be," *etiamsi liberi simus*—of sworn allegiance, with a saving clause of vast importance, "so far as is consistent with the Law of God."[1]

The assembled divines had no doubts concerning their rights and their duties. They had not yet in view the separation of Church and State as two distinct though interpenetrating communities, but they distinguished the functions of ecclesiastical and civil administrators with a clearness foreign to their own practice, and they agreed with the most arrogant of the Popes in defining the relation of the two authorities. The scheme was an academic ideal, but it contained seeds which were to germinate in ways

externis tamen quibusdam ritibus ab ipso Christo institutis et verbi Dei velut publica legitimaque disciplina non solum cernitur cognosciturque, sed ita construitur ut in hanc sine his nemo nisi singulari Dei privilegio censeatur."

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 112. "Quantisper huius imperia cum eo, propter quem hunc reveremur, palam non pugnant." The grammar is obscure, but the sense is quite clear.

beyond their apprehension. The Confession of 1536 was immensely enlarged, and made far more contentious in the great *Confessio Helvetica* of 1566, when the Council of Trent had to be answered. What is remarkable about the earlier draft is that the adversaries of the Reformation could find little fault in it except a definite rejection of the Roman primacy, a brief criticism of ceremonies, and some eloquent silences.

It is interesting to observe that Erasmus had returned to Basel, where he died six months after the meeting of the divines. The Reformers had scorned his advice, and he had small patience with their headstrong methods, but some of them were old friends ; it is reasonable to suppose that intercourse with him may have contributed to the moderation of their utterance on this occasion. Another visitor of note was present. The young Calvin had come to Basel to pass through the press the first edition of his *Institutio*, and Bullinger many years afterwards remembered an interview with the unknown student. But Calvin belongs to the second stage of the Reformation, and he must have a chapter to himself.

CHAPTER II

CALVIN

THE question may be asked, whether Geneva made Calvin or Calvin made Geneva. Either statement isolated would be false. The city was already in the full tide of Reformation before Calvin appeared on the scene, and his *Christianæ Religionis Institutio* was already printed and had made some stir in the world. But the two were as a wedded pair, and Calvinism is the fruit of their union.

He was Jean Cauvin—a name which he Latinized, after the fashion of the time, as Calvinus. The first thing of importance about him is that he was a Frenchman, endowed with the Frenchman's realism and logical precision. The second is that he was a Frenchman of Picardy, a province noted for unkindly air and ungrateful soil, qualities which southern Frenchmen pretend to find shared by the inhabitants. His father was Gérard Cauvin, a shrewd man of business settled at Noyon, where he held administrative posts under the Bishop and the Chapter. The Bishop was a cadet of the local family de Montmor, a prelate of easy manners and doubtful reputation. Gérard intended his younger son to serve the Church, or at least to enjoy the fruits of such service. At twelve years of age the boy was promoted by the kindly bishop to a benefice in the cathedral; at seventeen he received in addition the parochial cure of Monteville, and two years later advantageously exchanged this for Pont-l'Evèque. It was an early introduction to the abuses current in the Church. By the tenure of these preferments he was bound to study for the priesthood, and with this aim he entered the University of Paris in 1523, now fourteen years old. That his time was not wasted may be inferred from what he had accomplished within the next ten years. His manners were

reputed to be austere, but a lifelong correspondence attests his capacity for making friends. Graduating after five years at Paris, he was persuaded by his father to take up the study of jurisprudence, which would open further avenues of preferment in the Church. For this purpose he attended for three or four years the schools of Orléans and Bourges, and was admitted to the doctorate with considerable distinction. According to some authorities he then began to practice law at Orléans.

So far he seems to have been little interested in the movement of the Reformation. He was no great humanist, though he had read Erasmus and enjoyed at Paris some acquaintance with the distinguished scholar generally known as Budæus. He studied Greek at Bourges with Melchior Wolmar, at whose house he met Théodore de Bèze, a clever boy ten years his junior, destined to become his successor at Geneva, his biographer, and almost his second self. He had already produced a book, a frigid commentary on Seneca *De Clementia*, in which he toyed with Stoicism. His theological studies had left impressed on him a quality of scholasticism which Erasmus may have taught him to scorn, but which he never lost ; his course of jurisprudence had more firmly moulded his mind and given it a juridical bent. Towards the end of the year 1533 he returned to Paris and found there an atmosphere of religious unrest.

The Gallicanism of the Councils of Constance and Basel survived in France, strengthened by the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438[1] and the Concordat of 1516, which gave to the King the appointment of all bishops and abbots, and seriously weakened the effective authority of the Papacy. The Italian adventures of Charles VIII and Lewis XII moreover brought them into frequent collision with the personal ambitions of the popes, and this enlargement of interest appealed to the pride of the nation, recovering from the long oppression of the wars with England. In these circum-

[1] Supposed by many historians to be a forgery. Funk, *Manual of Church History*, vol. ii, p. 47.

stances the Lutheran revolt from the Papacy inevitably evoked a measure of sympathy, but Luther's positive teaching made little headway, and orthodoxy was guarded by the authority of the great School of the Sorbonne. Some prosecutions for heresy, with the usual result of the faggots, mark a slight infiltration of ideas from beyond the Rhine, or from the numerous Swiss mercenaries serving in the French armies. There were indigenous reformers who avoided a breach with the Church. Jacques Lefèvre, better known as Faber Stapulensis, antedated Luther by some years; his translation of the New Testament was condemned and publicly burnt in 1525, but he died in the peace of the Church nine years later. In 1516 his friend, Guillaume Briçonnet, became Bishop of Meaux, where he established himself with some personal followers—including Farel, the subsequent Reformer of Geneva—and carried on a quiet campaign of practical and doctrinal reform extending as far as Paris.

The incurable frivolity, public and private, of Francis I made it impossible for him to pursue any consistent policy except that of defence against the growing power of the House of Austria. He alternated between slack toleration and ruthless suppression of the new opinions. He intrigued with the Lutherans to move them against Charles V, and for a like reason offered the Reformed of Zurich support against the Forest Cantons, while he was sending disciples of both parties to the stake in France. He had the effrontery to assure the Protestant princes that the penalty was not inflicted for religion but for sedition, and in the same breath to engage them in a scheme of rebellion and civil war. It is fair to remark that persecution was the work far more of the Parlement of Paris than of the ecclesiastical authorities. When Calvin returned to Paris in 1533 Francis was with Clement VII at Marseilles, arranging the marriage of his son Henry, afterwards his successor, to Catherine de' Medici, the Pope's great-niece; the espousals were vainly designed to bring back the Duchy of Milan to the House of France,

and more surely portended severe measures against the reformed doctrines. The King's brilliant sister, Margaret of Navarre, was in Paris, where her court at the Louvre rendered all possible help to the preachers of Meaux, and watched with anxiety the new trend of affairs. The city was fierce against reform, and against the Bishop—Jean du Bellay—who was suspect of favouring it. The University was divided; Humanists were opposed to the Sorbonne, the Sorbonne thundered against the Louvre, and the College of Navarre lampooned their queen in a diverting comedy. On November 1st the newly elected rector, Nicholas Cop, delivered his inaugural oration.

Then the storm burst. It was whispered that the rectorial address had been composed, in whole or in part, by the young Picard lawyer, Jean Cauvin, and the authorship was afterwards avowed. It is uncertain how far he was expressing the Rector's mind, how far he had himself moved in the direction of Reform. The oration, while observing the forms of orthodox piety, bristled with sentences savouring of heresy. The King was furious, and ordered the Parlement to investigate the matter. Cop disappeared into a safe obscurity, and eventually found an asylum at Basel. Calvin also retired into the provinces; in the following May he was back at Noyon, where he resigned his benefices. Shortly afterwards he was residing at Saintes, says Beza, at Angoulême, say others, where he was asked to write postills for the parish priests of the neighbourhood. Beza hints that he put some evangelical savour into these,[1] but he evidently had not yet broken away from the Church. Thence he travelled south to visit Jean Lefèvre, who was living at Nérac under the protection of Queen Margaret, made one more brief sojourn at Paris, and at the end of the year 1534 sought, like Nicholas Cop, the safe harbourage of Basel. Earlier in that year he had published at Orléans,

[1] "Amico cuidam operam dedit, cuius rogatu breves admonitiones Christianas scripsit, quas parochis nonnullis inter sacra recitandas tradebat, ut paulatim populi ad veritatis indagandæ studium allicerentur."

under the fanciful title *Psychopannychia*, a treatise dealing with some supposed heretics who held that the soul slumbered between death and resurrection. These are nowhere named, nor are there any references to their writings, but in a preface " ad amicum quendam," their error is identified with that of John XXII, which the University of Paris had compelled the Pope to retract. In the preface to a second edition they are vaguely described as " Anabaptists," the common term of abuse at the time. I do not know what to make of it, unless it were a clumsy piece of irony, intended to exhibit a famous Pope as a heretic refuted out of Scripture and the ancient Fathers. Some violent exegesis of the Old Testament is employed, and the book called Ecclesiasticus is thus brought into the argument, with some doubt expressed as to its authority.

It appears, therefore, that Calvin arrived at Basel, if not in a state of suspended judgment, at all events without having deeply committed himself to the cause of the Reformation. He was engaged at this time on the production of his first important work, *Christianæ Religionis Institutio.*[1] This must not be confused with the massive tome published under the same title in the year 1559, the *Summa* of all that is meant by Calvinism. It is a brief treatise of four chapters dealing with the Decalogue, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, followed by one of more controversial tone directed against the extended sacramental system of the Catholic Church, and a sixth on the pressing question of Christian liberty as affected by the interaction of civil and ecclesiastical authorities. The fifth chapter thus committed him definitely to the most combative conclusions of the Reformed, with whom he was now in close contact. This was made even more evident by a prefatory epistle addressed to the King of France, expostulating with him on the policy of active persecution induced by his new alliance with the Pope. Francis was soon to abate this when seeking the

[1] Finished in March, 1536.

support of the Protestant princes of Germany against Charles V, but it had now been raging for more than a year, and we must bear in mind that it was the first concentrated onslaught of the kind on the Reformed doctrines. The epistle, dated or perhaps post-dated on the first of August, 1536, shows that Calvin was still unwilling to give up the hope of peaceful penetration and gradual transformation of the Gallican Church, but the reference to a *paupercula ecclesia* which the King was persecuting shows even more plainly the emergence of a movement towards external separation. Even more striking is the hardly veiled warning at the end of the epistle, amounting almost to a threat, that a continuance of the present policy will in the long run lead to civil war and the ruin of the kingdom.[1]

Leaving his book to pass through the press at Basel, Calvin journeyed into Italy, visiting the King's sister-in-law, Renée, Duchess of Ferrara, long afterwards noted as a protector of Huguenots on her lands in the Orléanais. Returning to France, where he was now perhaps too well known to live in safety, he arranged his private affairs for a prolonged exile, and tried to make his way by an unfrequented route to Strassburg or Basel. This brought him accidentally to Geneva, a city, says Beza, to which he had given no thought. There he found an active reform in progress under the guidance of his former acquaintance at Paris, Guillaume Farel, who adjured him with a tremendous imprecation in the Name of God to engage in that task. He reluctantly consented, and so began his career in the place with which his fame is inseparably connected, and in which he wrought to its completion the system of theology and religion to which the judgment of posterity has inseparably attached his name. It was the month of July, 1536; he was exactly twenty-seven years of age.

[1] "Nos quidem, velut oves mactationi destinatæ, ad extrema quæque redigemur; sic tamen ut in patientia nostra possideamus animas nostras, et manum Domini fortem expectemus, quae indubie tempore aderit, et sese armata exeret tum ad pauperes ex afflictione eruendos, tum etiam ad vindicandos qui tanta securitate nunc exultant contemptores."

CHAPTER III

CALVINISM

GENEVA was a place of ancient importance in the Kingdom of Burgundy, nominally, and in certain respects practically, a part of the Empire. As in other episcopal cities, the Bishop was Count, enjoying all military and civil authority. This temporal power was usually entrusted to a Lieutenant or Vicedome.[1] Basel and Strassburg, to mention only two cities with which we have been concerned, had by this time been almost entirely enfranchised from the lordship of their bishops, and were governed by magistrates with all but sovereign power. The citizens of Geneva were still subject, though turbulent. The reason was that the dukes of Savoy, whose territories surrounded the city, had acquired by agreement with the Court of Rome the right of nominating the Bishop, and by agreement with their nominees had themselves appropriated the office of Vicedome, executing its functions by resident lieutenants. Against this powerful combination the citizens and their magistrates had little chance of extending or even maintaining their liberties. Their nearest Swiss neighbours, the people of Freiburg and Bern, watched these encroachments of the House of Savoy with resentment, and not without fear ; it was their traditional policy to gain allies by the emancipation of cities or districts so dominated, and they began to intrigue with the Genevese. The malcontents in the city organized themselves under the name of " Huguenots,"[2] which was soon to achieve a wide celebrity.

[1] See Ducange, *s.v.* Vicedominus.

[2] Usually regarded as borrowed from the Swiss *Eidgenossen*, but taken by Littré, *s.v.* to be a diminutive of *Hugues*, the name of a prominent leader.

François de Bonivard, Abbot of St. Victor, a hero of history as well as of romance, was among them. In 1530 the revolution broke out ; the Bishop fled to the remoter parts of the diocese, from which his successors never returned. The Duke took steps to besiege the rebellious city, but Freiburg and Bern moved to its support, and other military operations with which we are not concerned weakened his hand. In 1534 Geneva contracted a close alliance with Bern, and the city, hitherto exclusively Catholic, was opened to the preachers of the Reformed. Two years later the Duke made a further attempt ; the Bernese put an overwhelming force in the field, tore from him the whole Pays de Vaud and lands beyond the lake, suppressed the Bishopric of Lausanne, and put Geneva beyond the reach of attack. In May, 1536, the citizens corporately accepted the Reformation, and the Helvetic Confession recently put forth. Two months later, as we have seen, Calvin arrived.

Here we have, for the first time, a genuine popular movement responding to the call of the Reformation. It was not the work of an established magistracy, as at Zurich and Basel, or of a close Patriciate, as at Bern. When Beza says that Calvin was pressed by the " Presbyterium " as well as by the magistrates to give his services to the city, we may conjecture that the Chapter was continuing to exercise some authority, but the formal adoption of the Reformation was carried by a vote of the whole assembly of citizens. But it is well to remember that the movement was at least as much political as religious, and it soon became apparent to Farel and Calvin that very little of what they understood as reformation, apart from externals, was intended. For less than two years they struggled against adverse circumstances, and then were banished from the city. Calvin retired to Strassburg, where he was allowed to assume the pastorate of a church of French refugees, and got for the first time into communication with the German Reformers. In 1541 he was called back to Geneva, and began the work which he carried on without interruption till his death in

the year 1564. His authority soon became pontifical. The system known as Calvinism was there inaugurated. Its nature has been much misunderstood. In England it is usually identified with Predestinarianism. But Calvin's doctrine of Grace did not differ much from the strict Augustinianism which dominated the Catholic Schools of Theology until the exaggerations of Baius of Louvain and his disciple Jansenius, the Bishop of Ypres, provoked the reaction towards Semipelagianism directed by Lessius and Molina and later Jesuits. With these things we are at present concerned only in so far as they affected Calvin's doctrine of the Church. The extent of their domination may be inferred from the definition of the Church set down in the Genevan Catechism. It is defined as " the body and society of believers whom God has predestined to eternal life."[1] It is said to be called Holy precisely on this account. As such it is Invisible in Luther's sense, with which Calvin entirely concurred. But he was much more definite than Luther in recognizing another sense in which the Church is a visible society known to men ; and this sense also is mentioned in the Catechism, though carefully excluded from the true definition. God himself is said to have described this visible Church by " sure indications and notes," which make it known to us, and seem to underlie the explanation of the word " Catholic " as used in the Creed. The Church is called Catholic because " all believers ought to coalesce into one body, so that there may be one Church diffused throughout the whole world, and not more than one."[2]

[1] *Catech. Eccl. Gene·.* " Corpus ac societas fidelium quos Deus ad vitam æternam prædestinavit." The Catechism was published both in French and in Latin. I quote from the Latin text included in Beza's great edition (1567) of his master's works.

[2] *Ibid.* " Est quidem et visibilis Dei Ecclesia quam nobis certis indiciis notisque descripsit : sed hic proprie de eorum congregatione agitur, quos arcana sua electione adoptavit in salutem. Ea autem nec cernitur perpetuo oculis, nec signis dignoscitur." " Quid sibi vult epitheton Catholicæ vel Universalis ? Eo docemur, sicut unum est fidelium omnium caput, ita omnes in unum corpus coalescere opportere, ut una sit Ecclesia per totum orbem diffusa : non plures."

Here the Catholic Church appears to be identified with the Visible Church, and it is not a divine creation but is brought into being by men, acting under a moral obligation in accordance with the indicated will of God.

In his writings we see Calvin at first struggling with this conception, and labouring to bring it into agreement with the existing state of things. Later, in the Fourth Book of the *Institutio*, he has it well in hand. Looking to the end, we find that the two necessary notes of the Visible Church are the faithful preaching of the Word of God, and the right use of the Sacraments. It is found wherever men are gathered together for this express purpose, " by towns and villages "—a significant detail, as we shall see—even though some of them be hypocrites and not true members of the Church Invisible.[1] But we must also look back to the beginning. If Calvin was engaged in organizing the Church in the city of Geneva, his outlook was far wider. He remained obstinately and patriotically French. German and Swiss Reformers were allies ; they were not of his own marrow. French was the language of Geneva, of whatever nationality it might be, and to some extent its people were French in thought and habit. He could work with them, but his heart was in France. The weapons which he forged there and the system which he planned were forged and planned for service in France ; in France, and under French influence far beyond, as he soon had vision to see. Some evidence of this outlook deserves consideration.

It has been said that Calvin, when prefixing to his first *Institutio* an epistle to the King of France, still kept in view

[1] *Inst.*, IV, 9. " Ubicunque Dei verbum sincere prædicari atque audiri, ubi sacramenta ex Christi instituto administrari videmus, illic aliquam esse Dei Ecclesiam nullo modo ambigendum est. . . . Ecclesiam universalem esse collectam ex quibuscunque gentibus multitudinem . . . sub hac ita comprehendi singulas Ecclesias, quæ oppidatim et vicatim pro necessitatis humanæ ratione dispositæ sunt, ut unaquæque nomen et auctoritatem Ecclesiæ iure obtineat : singulos homines, qui pietatis professione inter Ecclesias huius modi censentur, etiamsi ab Ecclesia sint revera extranei, ad ipsam tamen quodam modo pertinere, donec publico iudicio exterminati fuerint."

the possibility of peaceful reformation in the French Church. Two long epistles addressed to friends a year or so later, during his first residence at Geneva, illustrate the fading of those hopes.[1] The recipients of the letters are said by Beza to have been Calvin's former host at Orléans, now promoted Official of the diocese of Le Mans, and Gérard Roussel, whom he had known at Paris as chaplain to the Queen of Navarre, now created Bishop of Oloron. Both had been forward in the work of cautious penetration. The former had accepted an appointment in that hierarchy of jurisdiction which was engaged in counteracting such movements. Calvin addresses him in tones of earnest remonstrance mixed with irony. He assumes that his old friend is still in heart and conscience a Reformer, and condoles with him on the difficulty of escaping from the Egyptian contamination with which he is threatened, and which he seems to have been describing—"*ut narras*"—as burdensome, asking for advice about his conduct in such circumstances. The stern monitor does not mince matters. We can see how far he has himself travelled. Not only are popular superstitions denounced, but the Mass itself has become for him the supreme abomination. He scorns the defence of those who plead that they can attend such impious displays without any interior consent.[2] He applauds the constancy of Cyprian, who would not, by a little evasive word expressly allowed him, escape the martyr's death. If it be urged that Cyprian's little word would have implied an act of idolatry, he is ready to show by irrefragable proofs that the papal religion is the very worst kind of idolatry that has ever been known. Some of the instances seem to be far-fetched. For example, to abstain from flesh-meat at other times may be lawful and even salutary, but to abstain in Lent is commerce with evil; it is a Christian duty to eat what is forbidden by so damnable an assumed authority.

[1] Included in the *Tractatus Theologici*, ed. Beza, 1567, pp. 409–434.

[2] "Se minime consentire interiori cordis affectu in ullam impietatem."

He thus holds out to his friend the alluring prospect of courting the martyrdom from which he himself had escaped into exile. Perhaps the new Official of Le Mans deserved it. But Calvin passes on from these ineptitudes to portray the kind of life which good Reformers should really try to live in France ; a life of retirement and domestic piety, in depicting which he anticipates the noblest features of the austere Puritanism which was destined to be in distant lands a conspicuous fruit of his sowing.

In the epistle to Roussel the same subject is differently treated. Calvin begins with an ironically expressed fear that his congratulations on his friend's promotion to the episcopate may seem " morose " in comparison with others which have been received, because he will deal largely with the dangers of that great and splendid station. But he believes that his very dear friend retains of his pristine piety enough to encourage hopes for the future. He then proceeds to a glowing description of the greatness of the episcopal office, mainly based on quotation from St. Paul. But he has reason to fear that Roussel is thinking less of that pastorate of souls than of its secular grandeur and power. He therefore launches out into a terrific indictment of the existing order and its abuses, the most abominable of which is the celebration of Mass.[1] To these Roussel will be committed, if he executes his office ; he cannot avoid them except by neglecting his duties. The first duty of a bishop is to preach ; if he preaches the Gospel he will have to denounce these abuses ; if he abstains, the " Væ mihi " of St. Paul threatens him. Moreover, the flock of Christ is being ravaged by wolves ; what will he do to rescue the sheep ? Can he bear to stand by as helpless ? There are many others in like case. Calvin has heard of abbots who detest the estate of monachism, but with more or less discontent retain their office and its emoluments because they are powerless to remedy the evil. He expends some rough humour, of a sort in which his later disciples far excelled

[1] " Quod est sacrilegium sub cælo Missa execrabilius? "

him, on attempts at compromise. With a curiously inverted reminiscence of More, he ridicules any prayer for souls in the "Utopian dungeon of Purgatory." He still believes that his old friend had some good intentions in accepting a bishopric, but warns him that they will be only a snare to him and to others, who will be induced by his example to abandon the cause of the Gospel, and may even come to the conclusion that reformers are not serious in their opposition to popery.[1] The only possible conclusion is that he must at once resign his bishopric. He may have to go into exile; that is far better than to lose his soul.

In this remarkable letter there may seem to be some shifting of ground. But that is illusory. If at first Calvin glances at his faint hopes of a year ago that a general reformation of the existing ecclesiastical establishment might be possible, that the bishops of France might become genuine pastors of souls after the apostolic model, he soon shows that he has lost all trust in such dreams. The historic Church has become in his judgment antichristian, the mystical Babylon, and the first duty of Christians is to come out of her. It was a tremendous resolution. So far as in him lay, he was now bent on wrecking the policy in which he had himself been engaged only three years earlier, and he loudly called on all who had then been with him to follow his example. His success in doing this determined future events in France.

After his recall to Geneva in the year 1541 Calvin became undisputed master of the city. He took no office but that of Professor of Theology, but for him theology meant the whole theory of human life, and as professor thereof he was the adviser, the guide and the controller of all human activities. He could think of no kind of government but a theocracy. Kings and dukes and magistrates were servants of God, holding office by divine providence,

[1] "Qui paulo sunt adhuc imbecilliores hac dubitatione percelluntur, iocone an serio, malitiosene an sincere adversus Papistas contendamus."

however they might be chosen. In political form he was still of the Middle Ages, though feeling after a new departure. Geneva was *in parvo* the *respublica Christiana* of medieval theory. Church and city were but two aspects of this one society, with two separate but closely associated sets of officers. The officers of the Church were the Presbyters of whom he read in the Epistles of St. Paul and in the Acts of the Apostles. They had no superiors, for he regarded the Apostles as temporary organizers, who passed away leaving no successors. They were preachers, pastors and administrators, functions being apportioned among them by agreement. This Presbyterate was of divine appointment, unalterable to the end of time. Its recruitment, its sessions, the ordering of its functions, were settled by the famous *Ordonnances Ecclésiastiques*, which are the most striking fruit of Calvin's orderly and juridical mind. The presbytery itself selected the men who were to fill its ranks, but they were not to be finally incorporated until they had been tested and approved by the general body of the faithful.

The magistrates, however, were no less concerned with religion. Hence the Consistory, the members of which were supplied, one-third by the Presbytery and two-thirds by the various City Councils. Its name and functions were borrowed, rather surprisingly, from the current practice of the Catholic Church; for it was a tribunal of discipline concerned with those cases of heresy, moral offences, and breaches of Church order, which had for many centuries been adjudicated by the consistorial courts of bishops.

I have said that Calvin meant Geneva to be a fount of reformation for France. But this organization could not be transplanted thither entire. The civil authorities would be everywhere more or less hostile; the supreme authority of the Crown was pledged to the most active resistance. In the long run, it is true, La Rochelle was to become another Geneva, though nominally subject to the French Crown; but at present there was no possibility of setting up the dual

control of the Genevan constitution. A presbytery, however, could be set up anywhere, secretly if not openly, and Calvin's doctrine of the Church afforded room for this partial development. Here we see the importance of his reference to the gathering of believers "by towns and villages." In any French commune, or even in a rural district without formal delimitation, there might be such a gathering, which would at once become a Church and could provide itself with a presbytery. The utmost that could be required was a visit of two or more presbyters already constituted elsewhere, to put the new Church on a proper footing.

This was the method followed. Preachers from Geneva swarmed into France; converts from France flocked to Geneva to qualify themselves for the work. Their disciples took to themselves the Genevan designation of Huguenots. We have seen that sporadic groups of Reformers had for some time maintained themselves in unobtrusive existence; these were either swept into the new movement or driven by its violence to make their peace with the old ecclesiastical order. For violence there was, in word and deed. Subject to fierce persecution, the Huguenots soon learnt to retaliate. Their close organization and firm discipline gave them a cohesion exceeding that of territorial relations. Before long we begin to hear of Huguenots in ordered bands, serving as mercenaries in the wars of the period, without any scrupulous regard for the cause which they were upholding. If they were treated as outlaws, outlaws they naturally became. There was frequent violence also at home in their villages. Calvin's strong language about the old religion, his denunciation of the Mass as idolatry, and of minor observances as abominable superstitions, were translated into exhortations calling them to emulate the deeds of destruction applauded in the Old Testament. Reprisals were inevitable, the official persecution was frequently sharpened, and partly justified, by complaints of such outrages.

Here we see a new aspect of the Reformation. It was become a popular movement. The revolting peasants in Germany, the Anabaptists everywhere, were denounced by the Reformers, and ruthlessly suppressed alike by Catholics, Protestants and Reformed. The Huguenots were harried by Catholics, were backed by the Reformed of Geneva, and flourished under persecution. Calvin taught theoretically obedience to the Civil Power, ordained of God ; his disciples acted, without restraint from him, as though only a godly prince were entitled to the allegiance of the godly. They spread through France, a growing avalanche of disorder. They overflowed into the Netherlands. Only on the middle Rhine did they find the Civil Power conformable, where the Elector Palatine adopted and established in his dominions the Genevan discipline. Elsewhere, by towns and villages, the new model of the Church established itself. When great territorial nobles were converted, they brought no new qualities into the movement, merely becoming militant leaders of the fluid mass against the hostile power of the Crown, a function to which they were traditionally accustomed. The movement remained spontaneous ; atomically organized, but cohesive.

When Calvin declined in years, the leadership of the Huguenots fell to Théodore de Bèze, whom we have seen as a child in the household of Melchior Wolmar, during the last year of Calvin's studentship. Being by birth of a higher, and certainly a more turbulent class than Calvin, he was, like him, destined for an ecclesiastical career, and was, like him but much more richly, provided with preferment before he reached manhood. He made no haste to take holy orders, and after passing as licentiate of Civil and Canon Law he proceeded in 1539 to the University of Paris, where he spent nine riotous years, distinguishing himself chiefly by the production of Latin poems, amorous and licentious. He then underwent conversion, chiefly, it would seem, at the instance of a lady to whom he had been tenderly attached, and who wished him to marry her. They fled to Geneva, where he

divested himself by a public marriage of the clerical habit. It is not to be doubted that he fell in the best sense under the influence of Calvin, whom he doubtless remembered as a grave and earnest young student at Bourges, and who now procured for him an appointment as Professor of Greek at Lausanne. At Calvin's instigation also he completed Clément Marot's translation of the Psalms into French verse, so providing the Huguenots with a book which became the very marrow of their public worship.

In 1553 Beza, as he is known to history,[1] wrote a treatise, "De Hæreticis a Civili Magistratu puniendis," in defence of the burning of Servetus. In 1559 he settled at Geneva, being admitted to citizenship and made assistant Professor of Theology, eventually succeeding to the chair at Calvin's death. His superior, however, employed him far more in France than at home. He was sent first to Nérac, to secure the adhesion of Jeanne d'Albret, the dispossessed Queen of Navarre, daughter of that Margaret who has played a hesitating part in this history. He was successful. Her husband, Antoine de Bourbon, consented, and their child Henry, whose succession to the French Crown was not yet even remotely in sight, was imbued from his earliest years with the principles or the tenets of Calvinism. It was during this visit that the constitution of the Huguenot Church was definitely settled on the basis of the separate existence of each local congregation, large or small, under a pastor and a consistory of elders and deacons. The variation from the Genevan model, due to inevitable circumstances, enhanced the popular element. Neighbouring churches were grouped in "Colloques," and these again in Provincial Synods; a National Synod was at least intended.

We are not concerned with the political confusion that ensued on the death, in July, 1559, of the implacable persecutor, Henry II, and the accession of the feeble-minded boy, Francis II. The queen mother, Catherine de' Medici had small cause either to regret or to respect her husband.

[1] And to Cambridge as the donor of a precious Codex.

A child of the Renaissance, the niece of a Pope, she regarded all religions with impartial contempt, except as instruments of policy, and her policy was to insist on the indifferent toleration of all in a peaceful kingdom. Her domination of the young King was disputed by his queen, Mary of Scotland, whose uncles, the Duke of Guise and the two Cardinals, his brothers, were for a vigorous continuation of the persecution. The seeds of the Wars of Religion were rapidly sown. In the following March came the farcical "Tumult of Amboise," an attempt of Huguenot nobles to capture the Guises, for what precise purpose is not known. In his *Life of Calvin*, Beza clears his master of any responsibility for this, in terms which seem to imply his own complicity.[1] Condé, the brother of the King of Navarre, was certainly engaged. Shortly afterwards Catherine secured the Chancellorship of the kingdom for Michel de l'Hôpital, the founder of the party known as the *Politiques*. The early death of Francis in the following December put an end to the power of the Guises, and saved the life of Condé. After the remaining three sons of Catherine, all weaklings, Antoine de Bourbon was the next heir to the Crown, and she called him into her counsels. There was much ferment. Two bishops, Jean de Montluc of Valence and Charles de Marillac of Vienne, were advocating a moderate reformation. In January, 1561, a royal edict ordered the Parlement to stop all proceedings against heretics. In August, at the meeting of the States General, the Nobles and the Tiers État demanded the secularization of all ecclesiastical property, the payment of the clergy by the State, and some kind of popular election to the episcopate. In September, at the abortive Colloquy of Poissy, Beza met the Cardinal of Lorraine almost on terms of equality, and faced in equal argument Laynez, the General of the Jesuits. But another kind of argument was approaching. Catherine had barely obtained from the estates a legal

[1] "Quum Calvinus ipse, quod certo scio, quidquid hoc fuit nunquam intellexerit."

right for Huguenots to assemble elsewhere than within the walls of cities, when the first of the Wars of Religion broke out. For thirty years there followed, with brief interludes of precarious truce, a weary alternation of gallant fighting and treacherous massacre, until exhaustion imposed peace. Beza lived to see, in his eightieth year, the rights of citizenship and even some privileges secured to the Huguenots by the Edict of Nantes.

This conflict, in which must be included the revolt of the Netherlands, produced an important change in the political aspect of Calvinism. In conjunction with the " Politiques," the Huguenots abandoned the unity of the *Respublica Christiana*, and allowed a theoretic separation of Church and State, as argued by Barclay in his book, *De Regno*.[1] That separation became actual when the two powers were unfriendly ; when they were friendly, it involved either something in the nature of a concordat, or else a watchful attitude on either side. When Henry III allied himself with his Huguenot subjects against the Catholic League and the dominant power of Spain, the Catholics took a leaf out of their opponents' book, and Spanish Jesuits were soon teaching that Church and State alike, each in its own sphere of operation, is a *Societas Perfecta*, sufficient to itself. The medieval theory thus received its death-blow, though it lingered many years moribund. It was those theologians who laid the foundation of the modern state, even while they questioned the right of an heretical king to reign ; but they learnt their lesson from the Huguenots.

This was, perhaps, the greatest departure from the Genevan standards made by the French Calvinists. Another had considerable importance. The appointment of a single pastor for each several Church was, perhaps unconsciously, a return to the episcopacy which Calvin had abandoned ; for the resultant organization bore a very close resemblance to the working system of the African episcopate in the

[1] On this, see Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius*, pp. 236 *seqq.*, and also in the *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. III, pp. 743-59.

time of St. Cyprian. The analogy has been pressed by Scottish theologians of our day.[1] Both changes have contributed to the growth of an almost democratic temper, the *plebs* of St. Cyprian being reproduced with curious fidelity in the Church meeting of the Calvinists. When John Knox returned in the year 1559 from Geneva to Scotland, he drew together the Reformed of that country into an organization based, with differences, on the Genevese union of Church and State ; but thirty years afterwards Andrew Melville, educated in France, told James VI to his face, " There are in Scotland two kingdoms, the kingdom of James Stewart, and the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, wherein James Stewart is a seely vassal." And Andrew Melville was the true founder of that Church of Scotland which has strenuously, if not always with perfect consistency, maintained this position ; sometimes requiring the King to be a covenanted supporter of the Kirk, at other times rendering him independent allegiance, but always with a jealous assertion of " the Crown rights of Christ," and until our own day with a certain uneasiness of relation. It is significant that no Church in Christendom enjoys a more unwavering popular support.

Another political aspect of Calvinism calls for attention. Rooted in the conception of the Visible Church as a voluntary association of believers, and sometimes flowering, is the idea of permeating human society with the spirit of the Gospel. To Luther's pessimism this was foreign ; to dogmatic Lutherans it became abhorrent. Calvin laboured to make Geneva a veritable City of God, as much by measures of police as by moral persuasion ; producing, it was said, a plentiful harvest of hypocrisy. Where the separation of Church and State has become more than theoretical, this danger is obviously diminished ; but there the Calvinist congregation tends to produce within itself an austere observance of certain specified duties narrowly

[1] See Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, pp. 196-204 and 286-306.

conceived, and the severe moralist is left free to engage in the affairs of the present world without much reference to his religion. Some students of economics profess to have found here the source of an individualism which they contrast with the economic teaching of the great Scholastics of the Middle Ages. Calvin is certainly not to be held accountable ; for in this respect, as in some others, he was not less medieval than St. Thomas Aquinas himself ; but there appears to be ground for attributing the result to a Calvinism which has ceased to be Genevan. There has, however, been a strong reaction, specially perceptible in America, which has turned back the influence of religious discipline upon external problems of social and economic order. On historic grounds carefully considered, a recent Dutch writer has claimed for Calvinism the origination of such movements. He deduces a curious contrast which is not without interest from our special point of view : " The idea of Christianization is so deeply ingrained in American religious thought that it will never be able to understand the orthodox Lutheran position with its deep distrust of this very idea."[1] A profound study of the history of the Reformation seems to lie behind that judgment. Lutheran piety leans to an other-worldliness which lets this present world go its own way to destruction.

[1] W. A. Visser 't Hooft, *The Background of the Social Gospel in America*, p. 47.

CHAPTER IV

ENGLAND UNDER HENRY VIII

IT is a curious historic illusion that dates the English Reformation from the reign of Henry VIII, and the poet who saw " gospel light first beam from Boleyn's eyes " had an exceptional gift of imagination. The respectably learned young King—he was thirty-one years of age—and amateur theologian, who defended against Luther the doctrine of the Seven Sacraments and was complimented by a Medicean Pope with the title " Fidei Defensor," continued to defend that doctrine by other methods as long as he lived. His subsequent quarrel with another Medicean Pope over his marriage with Catharine of Aragon, and his excommunication by Paul III, were of a piece with many similar adventures of Catholic kings before and after him ; it was diplomatically healed, like those other ruptures, after the lapse of twenty years, and if his daughter Mary had succeeded him immediately it would have been closed even more easily and at an earlier date. It had nothing in common with the religious revolt of the Lutheran princes. When at one period of his reign he entertained the idea of an alliance with them, to be cemented by one of his unfortunate experiments in wedlock, it was only because he had need of military and diplomatic support against the Emperor, Charles the Fifth ; the need soon passed, and with it the dalliance ; the poor " Flanders mare," Anne of Cleves, was got rid of by an adroit turn of the Canon Law,[1] and

[1] There was talk of a precontract, never proved, but the judgment of Convocation turned chiefly on the King's very frank avowal that from the time he set eyes on her he withheld his " internum, purum, perfectum et integrum consensum." The documents are in Burnet, *Records*, Part I, Book III, 18 and 19. Pocock vol. iv, pp. 430-439.

treated rather better than might have been expected. The intended Protestant bride proved to be a good Catholic, and enjoyed the favour of Queen Mary until her death in the year 1557.

It is nevertheless true that Henry prepared the way for the Reformation in England. He did this unintentionally, perhaps unwittingly, perhaps counting on his power to interpose a barrier. He did it in two ways. In the first place, at the time when he took action a quarrel with the Pope could hardly fail to have some such effect. Henry may not have seen this. He probably thought of the trouble in Germany as localized, and as abating even there. The movement seemed just then to have come to a standstill. He may have been blinded. His impetuous desire to be quit of his wife, his equally impetuous and more reasonable desire to have a son, a successor, occupied his thoughts. So far as he was able to look away from himself, his mind was set on precedents, not on the possible results of his adventure. His policy was based on that of bygone emperors who had fought the popes with variable fortune and sometimes with success—especially, perhaps, Lewis of Bavaria—and he would follow their example. To this end his Italianate creature, counsellor and victim, Thomas Cromwell, provided an English translation of the "Defensor Pacis" of Marsiglio, the adviser of Lewis. To this end he made the bold and unhistorical assertion: "By divers sundry and authentic histories and chronicles it is manifestly declared and expressed that this realm of England is an Empire, and so hath been accepted in the world."[1] To this end he extorted from the clergy a guarded acknowledgement of his standing as "Supreme Head" of the Church. It is but reasonable to point out that he did no more in that capacity than had been done by such emperors

[1] Preamble of the Statute for Restraint of Appeals, 24 Henry VIII, c. 12. I do not know where any evidence for this could be found, except in the pompous style sometimes affected by Edgar, King of Wessex, "Anglorum Basileus . . . Imperator et Dominus."

as Justinian and Charles the Great. But to do this was for the time being to weaken the Papacy, and to weaken the Papacy as things then stood was to help the cause of the Reformation. But Henry did this, in the second place, far more directly, though still unwittingly, by planting Cranmer at Canterbury. For Cranmer was already more than inclined to Lutheranism, keeping his inclination carefully veiled within his breast.

The most conspicuous fruits of Henry's ecclesiastical policy betrayed no leaning towards the Reformation. In his wholesale suppression of Religious Houses he was following the modest example of Wolsey, and outclassing his contemporary, Ferdinand of Austria, who with the Pope's hearty concurrence was despoiling convents, and appropriating their revenues to the expenses of his wars against both Turks and Protestants. The simultaneous erection of several new bishoprics was precisely the method adopted by Philip II thirty years later for arresting the progress of the Reformation in the Netherlands, a method bitterly resented by the Calvinists of those parts. The limited circulation of an English version of the whole Bible will be reckoned a promotion of the Reformed doctrines only by those who have persuaded themselves that the Holy Scriptures, read without note or comment, are a manual of Protestantism. The King hunted down those who introduced into the country Tyndale's notes and comments, and placed in every parish church Coverdale's unadulterated text.

Whether Henry had any true regard for the Catholic religion, or for anything else except his own advantage, may reasonably be doubted. That he hated heresy is indisputable, for he showed his feeling by careful and active persecution. In all that he did, good and evil, it is clear that he carried his people with him, and not least in this particular activity. The Pilgrimage of Grace was an abortive protest from the one part of the country where the monasteries seem to have had a hold on the affection of the Commons. In pursuance of his quarrel with the Pope he

could send men like More and Fisher to the scaffold, the London Carthusians to Tyburn, without encountering a tremor of popular opposition. Henry was too astute to leave his stark procedure without the trappings of legality, but in other respects he lacked nothing of the character of a tyrant, and for the time being the people of England were patient under tyranny.

If Henry was not the originator of the Reformation in England, an even earlier origin has been sought for it. All is traced back to Wyclif, and national pride sees in him the Morning Star of the whole movement. This will not bear examination. Wyclif's subversive speculations were concerned more with economics than with theology. It is true that economic theory, like everything else concerning human life, was treated by the scholastic theologians, and in some cases even by dogmatic definitions, so that it might be made matter of heresy, but it was remote from the interests of the historic Reformers, who were content with the orthodox tradition. In spite of his dislike of the Mendicant Orders, Wyclif followed the Spiritual Franciscans and their champion, William of Ockham,[1] in maintaining that spiritual persons ought not to possess property, but only to enjoy the necessary uses of it. He managed, however, to retain his rectory of Lutterworth, for in an imperfect world practice does not always jump with theory. This teaching had been condemned as heretical by John XXII. Wyclif extended it in other directions by his strange doctrine, still more abstract and theoretic, that *dominium*, the right of owning property, is founded on grace, a man not in the state of grace having no good title. It was this which in 1381 led to the great insurrection of the peasantry. A flood of vernacular tracts and the Wyclifite versions of the Bible with pungent comments kept alive an underground agitation long afterwards ; the process of heresy, unfamiliar in England, became frequent, and the Lancastrian statute *De hæretico com-*

[1] It was perhaps an accident that Ockham and Wyclif were philosophically agreed in an extreme form of Nominalism.

burendo was passed to regulate the support lent by the temporal arm to the spiritualty.

Wyclif's criticism of the doctrine of Transubstantiation was of purely scholastic interest, and his theological influence was negligible except in Bohemia, whither his writings seem to have been conveyed by persons attached to the court of Richard the Second's queen, the sister of King Wenceslaus. There he inspired John Hus, and shared, *post-mortem*, the condemnation of his disciple by the Council of Constance. The long Hussite wars, and the chaotic sects which they engendered, certainly spilled something into Saxony which was absorbed into Lutheranism, but the fighting remnant of the Taborites contributed rather to the Peasants' Revolt and to the excesses of the Anabaptists. Only by this circuitous route was Wyclif connected with the great movement of Reformation.

Lollards—the unexplained popular name for the scattered disciples of Wyclif—maintained a precarious existence in England until the sixteenth century. Can they be linked with the Reformation? John Foxe, the Martyrologist, claimed them as precursors. He found himself oppressed by the question, "Where was your Church before the Reformation?" According to Calvin, it had always existed somewhere. Foxe sought visible traces of it among the persecuted heretics of his own country. It is interesting for our purpose to observe what he found during the first twenty years of the sixteenth century.

Gairdner has unduly minimized the evidence.[1] Much that Foxe recorded is worthless; but when allowance is made for his persistent colouring of the facts, for his eager acceptance of old-wives' tales and tendencious memories, and even for some worse practices, it remains clear that Lollardy was still prevalent in some parts of the country. The most remarkable testimony comes from Richard Fitz-James himself, the persecuting Bishop of London. Petitioning the

[1] James Gairdner, *The English Church, from the accession of Henry VIII to the death of Mary*, Chaps. iii and iv.

King in the year 1515 to stop the indictment of his Chancellor, Dr. Horsey, accused of murdering one of the victims, the Bishop wrote: "Assured am I, if my chancellor be tried by any twelve men in London, they be so maliciously set *in favorem hæreticæ pravitatis* that they will cast and condemn any clerk, though he were as innocent as Abel." But Fitz-James was a worn-out old man, with a terrible scandal on his hands, whom timidity may have moved to exaggeration; a popular dislike of the officials of ecclesiastical courts, as old as Chaucer at least, would not necessarily imply any agreement with heretics, except in a common antipathy. Not even Foxe could find much popular tenderness for his sufferers, whom he was rather disposed to exalt as exceptional saints submerged in a flood of iniquity. Nor are his lists very impressive. He is honest enough to show that the great majority of the accused abjured their heresies, and that some even of those that were burnt as relapsed heretics confessed and were absolved before their death. Many were little more than vulgar railers at the clergy, such as are well known in our own day. One can sympathize with a man who denounced a Pope of the time as "a strong strumpet," even if he was imperfectly acquainted with the life of the Vatican palace. Foxe is fain to allow that some of his martyrs and confessors were "weak, infirm and earthy vessels," who did not adorn the Gospel, while others showed a deplorable readiness to go to Mass, though charged with irreverence towards the Sacrament. The much discussed Richard Hunne, the supposed victim of Dr. Horsey, is regretfully found to have been "no full protestant" three years before Luther posted his theses, but Thomas Butler at a still earlier date seems to have anticipated the Saxon Reformer in his most exuberant Table Talk mood, saying that "Whosoever departeth in the faith of Christ and the Church, howsoever he hath lived, shall be saved." On the other hand there are many complaints of language about the Sacrament of the Altar, evidently the fruit of Wyclif's polemic against Transubstantiation, which

Luther would have fiercely condemned. The worst side of Arundel's synodical legislation is much in evidence, men and women being frequently delated for possessing or reading parts of the New Testament in English, and even for teaching one another the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Angelic Salutation in the vulgar tongue. It is pitiful to read of a man accused of making the not unreasonable remark that these prayers might be more used if they were allowed in English. On one occasion it is clear that marginal notes on translations were the chief cause of offence, but if Foxe's excerpts from the Registers are to be trusted this explanation will not always suffice. Indeed, the possession of the bare texts had been since Arundel's time a canonical offence, for which penance could be imposed. It does not, however, appear that for supporting a formal charge of heresy this would be more than corroborative evidence. Foxe's vague statements on the subject are not to be trusted. Pilgrimages, invocation of saints, and the veneration of sacred images were frequent objects of derision ; an objection to English versions of the Decalogue may point to a full text of the second commandment according to the Hebrew canon.

In sum, it is clear that Lollards were fairly numerous, restless and given to rashness of speech, but seldom inclined to stubbornness in actual heresy. They presented points of contact to the earliest Reformers who penetrated into England, but more than this cannot be affirmed.

The penetration was not long delayed. The earliest reference to Luther that I have found in Foxe's lists of sufferers belongs to the diocese of London early in the episcopate of Cuthbert Tunstall, who succeeded Fitz-James in the year 1522. We have had occasion to observe the infiltration of Lutheran and Reformed teaching into France, and a measure of favour shown to it even by Churchmen before the Calvinist invasion sharpened cleavage. Something analogous will be found in England. But the circumstances of the two countries were very different. During the first twelve years after the emergence of Luther and Zwingli the

Church of England was far more directly subject to the Roman See than the Church of France, and abuses were far less rife ; the only grave scandals affecting the episcopate were the accumulation of dignities on Wolsey, and the appropriation of the bishopric of Worcester for thirty-eight years to Italian prelates acting as the King's representatives at the Papal Court. France had no outstanding ecclesiastical statesman of the calibre of Wolsey, nor anything comparable with the concentration of spiritual authority in the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury and his Convocation of the Clergy. But the greatest difference was that between an insular and a continental kingdom. England was not indeed an island, but the Scottish border was negligible in this respect. Sundering seas and closely guarded ports effectively checked the entrance of undesirable aliens. Still there were avenues. The considerable trade of London already meant much coming and going. The universities still retained something of their international character, Cambridge being more affected by this than Oxford. Erasmus had left his mark there. Known to have been influenced by him was Thomas Bilney, who was afterwards convicted of Lutheran errors, recanted, but in 1531 once more confessed and was reconciled before going to the stake in the ordinary course as a relapsed heretic. A considerably younger contemporary was John Frith, a singularly attractive person afterwards heard of at Oxford, who went abroad, studied further at Marburg, where he seems to have forsaken Luther for the teaching of Œcolampadius, was arrested during a visit to England, was condemned by Cranmer on a charge of heresy concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, and made a very gallant end without recantation. Senior to Frith by some years was William Tyndal, who left the University in 1521, apparently with unsettled opinions, and took a private tutorship in his native county of Gloucestershire. Here he translated the *Enchiridion* of Erasmus, and shortly afterwards the new *Paraphrases* came into his hands. This book determined his

future. He was fired by the eloquent aspiration of the great humanist for vernacular versions of Scripture, "that the husbandman at his plough, the weaver at his loom, the sailor at the helm, the woman with her distaff, might solace their labour with the sacred words."[1] He resolved to make a beginning, well aware that the task was forbidden by law to any unauthorized translator. He seems to have been strangely unacquainted with the Wyclifite versions. From Gloucestershire he passed to London, furnished with introductions which might bring him to the notice of Cuthbert Tunstall, newly elected bishop. Of this cultured and scholarly prelate he had great expectations, hoping indeed to obtain a place in his household, where he would be able to work at his translation of the New Testament in the only way allowed by law, under episcopal control. To these few names from Cambridge may be added that of Hugh Latimer, destined to play a conspicuous part, but then only an obscure and industrious scholar who meddled to his peril with the new doctrines, and saved himself by unreserved abjuration. That they had fairly numerous companions may be inferred from the fact that the scholars removed by Wolsey from Cambridge to his magnificent new foundation at Oxford were freely accused of introducing Lutheran ideas to a seat of learning hitherto uncontaminated.

These were academics. Another kind of infiltration was beginning in London. Robert Barnes was a popular preacher in the City, who had some particular relations with the privileged society of the German merchants of the Steelyard.[2] Through them he obtained German books, which he seems to have been able to read. It is hard to say

[1] *Præf. ad Paraphrases.* "Ego cum divo Hieronymo sentiens, citius gratuler gloriæ crucis, magnificumque cum primis ac triumphale duxerim, si linguis omnibus ab omni hominum genere celebretur: si stivam tenens arator aliquid sua lingua decantet e psalmis mysticis; si textor assidens telæ non nihil ex evangelio modulans soletur laborem; hinc nauclerus affixus clavo cantillet aliquid; denique ad colum sedenti matronæ sodalis aut cognata hinc recitet aliquid."

[2] *D.N.B.*, Vol. III, p. 254.

whether he was ever a Lutheran. In opinion, sometimes incautiously uttered, he swung between the Saxon Reformation and an extreme form of Zwinglianism. For some reason he was favoured by Gardiner; still more by Cromwell, and even by Henry, whom he served in the abortive negotiations with the Schmalkaldic League. After a chequered career of commendation and rebuke he eventually reached the stake and the faggots, by the unusual way of an Act of Attainder; not so much, men said, because he was a heretic as because he had mismanaged the affair of Anne of Cleves. But this was not until 1540, when the Act of the Six Articles had been passed and Cromwell had fallen. Fifteen years earlier, about the time when Tyndal was in London, he had been compelled to abjure at St. Paul's with four of his friends the German merchants.[1]

Among the citizens engaged in the German trade was a wealthy wool-merchant, Humphrey Monmouth, who happened to hear Tyndal preach, became his patron, and made him a home in his own house. Disappointed and soured by the refusal of Tunstall to help him, Tyndal thus fell into new company, from which he rapidly acquired the elements of Lutheranism. Among others he met John Frith, with whom he formed an affectionate and abiding friendship. In 1524 he resolved to visit Germany, where he hoped to find an opportunity for printing his translation, clearly unattainable in England. Supplied with funds by Monmouth he took ship for Hamburg, where the Reformation was not yet established. It is difficult to follow his movements. Whether he visited Luther at Wittenberg is a disputed question. After a failure at Cologne, the book was produced from the press of Petrus Schœffer at Worms, and by the summer of 1526 copies had been secretly conveyed to England.

Tyndal was a competent Greek scholar, but he leaned heavily on Luther's German version, repeating some of its

[1] Gairdner, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

mistakes.[1] There were two impressions, one in quarto with marginal comments, the other in octavo without them. Many of the comments were borrowed from Luther, but others reflect the extreme teaching of Œcolampadius, or even of Carlstadt, to which Tyndal must have rapidly advanced while at Worms. The translation was attacked by Sir Thomas More, mainly because of the disuse of such consecrated words as *church*, *priest*, *charity* and *penance*, but the marginal notes were a much greater offence. Tyndal replied fiercely ; he was not ill-matched against so doughty an adversary, and as a writer of English he bears the palm. Here at least he was victorious ; for when the bishops at last did what they ought to have done at the first, and in 1537 authorized a text of the whole Bible without note or comment, the greater part of it was but slightly altered from his, and became the foundation of all subsequent versions. But by that time Tyndal had paid the penalty for his work in Flanders.

It should be observed that all through the period of Cromwell's ascendency, though he was probably inclined to favour heretics, at least as enemies of the clergy, the proscription of Lutheranism never ceased. Under the Six Articles it was intensified. It was then that Cranmer sent back his German wife to her uncle at Nürnberg. Wife we may call her, for he had presumably contracted a matrimony which was valid in Germany, though a nullity in English law. The presence of a lady in his household would not cause any grave scandal, for contemporary Popes had condoned such relations by the public acknowledgment of their own offspring ; but the King had undertaken a new censorship of clerical morals, and the archbishop hastened to comply. Nor was he himself slack in

[1] e.g., the rendering of ψυχικὸς (1 Cor. ii, 14, and elsewhere) by *naturlich*. This has been excused on the ground that the German language had no word equivalent to the original or to the Latin *animalis*. Tyndal had no such excuse for his " natural," which he fastened on all subsequent English versions. The Wyclifite translators had written more accurately " beestli."

repression. Whatever his personal opinions may have been —opinions about which the prebendaries of his own church at Canterbury made vain conjectures and complaints—he conformed and insisted on others conforming to the public ordinances of the Church. He should not be accused of insincerity. It is probable that he seriously thought conformity a more important duty than the utterance of doubtful novelties. More germane to my subject is the general adhesion to this judgment which may be inferred from the records of persecution. Unuttered opinions could not, of course, be treated as heresy; but even the more vocal were usually able to plead a certain constancy of orthodox practice which paved the way for abjuration and a milder penance. The sting of the statute of the Six Articles lay in the closing of this refuge. There was a difference between the old Lollardy and the new invasion from Germany. The Lollards kept up a tradition of open protest against certain aspects of religion which had once been challenged by forgotten speculation; imported Lutheranism and its rivals consisted of a new challenge which had not yet found a standard expression even in negative action. Foxe was sometimes puzzled by this. Writing at a time when there was such a standard definitely established, he found some of his best martyrs strangely inconsistent. Thomas Bilney, for example, was all that could be desired in speech "against idolatry, invocation of saints, vain worship of images, false trust to men's merits, and such other gross points of religion," but on the other hand, "as touching the mass and sacrament of the altar, as he never varied from himself, so likewise he never differed therein from the most gross catholics."[1] There were some, like poor Anne Askew, who could throw off every vestige of the religion in which they were bred, openly and violently contradict all the teachings of the Church, flout all authority, and die courageously or exultingly for a testimony to the world. But they were few, and they could not even form a sect. If by the Reformation

[1] *Acts and Monuments*, ed. Pratt, 1870; Vol. IV, p. 649.

we mean a new ordering of religion, consequent on a revival or restatement of doctrine—and I do not know what else it should mean—then there was no Reformation in England during Henry's reign.

Nor does there seem to have been any popular ferment, as of men ready to meet it half way. Tokens of sympathy are lacking. Perhaps there was too much other hanging and burning to make any impression. It is generally agreed to-day that frequent brutality of punishment defeats the purpose intended. The sentiment alike of pity and of fear is blunted ; punishment ceases to be deterrent and becomes an incitement. The courage of Foxe's heroes may have been less than we, knowing how we should shrink from their trial, are apt to conceive. Traitors and felons, or those who passed for such, made an equal display of fortitude, or of its semblance in bravado. Henry forced the comparison. On the day when Robert Barnes with two companions suffered at Smithfield for heresy, three others suffered at the same place for the treason of denying the King's supremacy. Between the modes of death, burning and disembowelment, there was not much to choose.

CHAPTER V

ACTION AND REACTION

HENRY VIII died in January, 1547. During the next thirteen years the Church of England survived three revolutions and more than one *coup d'état*. My task is not to tell the story of these violent events, which has been told often enough, from various points of view and with varied coloration. The outlines are not blurred, even by controversy, and it is reasonable to assume familiarity with them on the part of those whom I address. But it may be well to specify the revolutions. They are, first, the overthrow of Henry's system, begun almost at once by those to whom he entrusted the guardianship of the child, his successor, and carried on by the introduction of that Reformation which he had consistently resisted and persecuted; secondly, the reversal by Mary, as arbitrary and as swift, of all that had been done in Edward's name, and of all that her father had done himself in the matter of the quarrel with Rome; thirdly, Elizabeth's prompt abandonment of her sister's policy, and partial resumption of her brother's Reformation. For a *coup d'état*, see Northumberland's dealing with Somerset or Mary's dealing with Northumberland. These things it is enough to mention. My task is to ascertain, if possible, how the people of England accepted these things, and with what manner of response. The four Tudors were personally so important—for even the reigning boy was more than a figurehead—that men may conveniently be classified under their names; there were Henricians and Edwardians and Marians and Elizabethans; then there emerge two other classes which I reserve for later treatment.

A careful investigation soon discovers a remarkable degree of personal stability throughout the period of disturbance. Very few bishops, it is true, achieved this distinction. Anthony Kitchen was consecrated Bishop of Llandaff when the Six Articles were in force, and retained the See through all changes until the fifth year of Elizabeth. John Salisbury was made suffragan of Thetford in 1536, carried on till 1571, and was then appointed by Elizabeth to the bishopric of Sodor and Man. John Hodgekyn, consecrated suffragan of Bedford for the diocese of London in 1537, served as such under Bonner and Ridley, was put aside for a time after Mary's accession but restored by Bonner, and ultimately became one of the consecrators of Matthew Parker and of eight other bishops in the second year of Elizabeth.

Less complete is the record of William Barlow, who turned his coat so often that it is hard to say which side shows the lining. An Augustinian canon-regular, he was drawn, like many of his order, to the teaching of Luther, who belonged to the Eremite congregation of Augustinians, but a visit to Germany brought disillusionment. Returning to England, he published in 1531 a "Dialogue" in which he fiercely assailed all varieties of the Reformation, asserting that it was the ruin of religion. This probably commended him to the King, who employed him on important business, including an embassy to Scotland, and made him Prior of Bisham, a convent which he afterwards surrendered in the course of the general suppression. In 1536 he was promoted to the bishopric of St. Asaph, and three months later to St. David's, where he served as a faithful Henrician till the King's death. A year later he was translated to Bath and Wells, and rendered inconspicuous but unswerving support to the Edwardian movement. After Mary's accession he promptly produced a new edition of his "Dialogue," with a preface of added violence denouncing "monstrous maried monkes and false fleshlie freers," thus putting himself in line with the second revolution. It was, however, discovered that he had himself committed matrimony, and he was compelled

to resign his See, suffering a brief imprisonment. He then changed his habit once more, made a fresh sojourn in Germany, and after five years of exile returned to England for the third revolution, received from Elizabeth a nomination to the See of Chichester, and became the principal consecrator of Matthew Parker. He died at an advanced age in 1568, leaving a son who flourished as a pluralist, and several daughters, all married, in spite of the Queen's objection, to bishops of the new style.

When Henry died the twenty-six episcopal Sees of the Church of England were all occupied, four of them by bishops—Voysey, Tunstall, Gardiner and Cranmer—who had been promoted before the breach with Rome. One of them, Knight of Bath and Wells, died before the revolution was fairly begun. The rest, without exception, acquiesced or gave their aid in the first steps taken, the repeal of the Six Articles, a general destruction of sacred images, and the amazing requirement that all bishops should take out a fresh commission from the Crown for the execution of their office. Bonner protested in his rough way; was imprisoned and submitted. Gardiner objected on the inadequate ground that such changes should not be made until the King came of age; was imprisoned, and submitted. One more bishop, Wakeman of Gloucester, died before innovation came to its height; two others, Rugg of Norwich and the aged Voysey of Exeter, resigned to avoid concurrence with the later stages. Four were violently removed, Gardiner and Bonner, Day of Chichester and Heath of Worcester, for refusing concurrence. The Protector Somerset and his Council, if weaker, were not less arbitrary than Henry had been, and when Northumberland had overthrown Somerset tyranny became unashamed. In the last year of the reign the venerable Cuthbert Tunstall, who had borne himself with singular caution, was thrust out of Durham, apparently for the sake of the plunder which that wealthy See would provide.

Thus at Mary's accession there were fifteen Henrician

bishops surviving in possession of Sees, and five others who had been violently dispossessed. These five were at once restored by the same power of the Crown which had removed them. What of the rest, who had aided or endured the Edwardian revolution to the end? Of Barlow and Kitchen enough has been said. Three others, Robert Holgate of York, John Bird of Chester, and Paul Bush of Bristol, were found, like Barlow, to have taken to themselves wives, and after a delay of seven or eight months were therefore summarily deprived. They do not appear to have withstood the Catholic reaction; Bush, released from his embarrassment by opportune widowhood, was provided for elsewhere, and Bird was engaged in attempts to reduce by persuasion the obstinacy of Marian martyrs. Of Cranmer it is needless to say much here, his fate being so well known. He showed unwonted courage in objecting to the restoration of the Latin Mass on the score of its illegality. His treasonable association with Northumberland in the affair of Jane Grey was for some weeks strangely overlooked, but he was eventually indicted and on his confession of guilt condemned to death. The attainder was by virtue of Henrician legislation treated as voidance of his See, but the difficulty of dealing with a man who was by papal provision Archbishop of Canterbury had to be postponed until the reconciliation with Rome was complete; his recantation after judgment for heresy showed him still the time-server that he had always been; the shameless ignoring of it enabled him to make a gallant end, but it is difficult to find any ground for according to him the honour of martyrdom.

The rest of the Henrician bishops, nine in number, remained undisturbed. If we add the five restored and Voysey, who now returned to Exeter, we find that fifteen out of the original twenty-six continued in function under Mary. All were to some extent implicated in the Edwardian revolution. One of them deserves particular attention. Thomas Thirlby, consecrated to the new See of Westminster in 1540, gave a hesitating but complete adhesion to the

English Prayer-book ; in 1550 he was translated to Norwich, leaving Westminster to be pillaged by Northumberland's crew ; more statesman than priest, he served in several embassies, and was chosen by Mary to represent her at the Papal Court on the business of the reconciliation ; after the accession of Elizabeth he declined to take part in the undoing of that work, was removed from his See, and lived for ten years in honourable custody, the compulsory guest of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

If bishops were so accommodating, what shall we expect of the clergy in general ? Some of them unquestionably were convinced reformers, for they were convicted of heresy and paid the penalty as soon as new legislation made it possible. Mary, it should be observed, proceeded with great respect for law, used the title of Supreme Head, and did not attempt to put down things allowed or commanded by Edwardian statutes until these were repealed. The Latin Mass, indeed, was generally restored without such sanction, but the English service continued in use at some places for several months. The brave men who so carried on knew the risk they were running, and faced it. Others of the same persuasion fled from the country betimes. Of these was John Ponet, intruded into Gardiner's seat at Winchester, a writer of distinction, a scholar and theologian of some merit, but a man of infamous character. Convicted by a jury of intermarrying with the wife of a butcher at Nottingham and cast in damages for the injured husband, he was nevertheless tolerated by men like Cranmer and Ridley. Equal to him in this respect was Hugh Weston, Dean of Westminster and Windsor, a principal champion of the Marian reaction. It is one of the griefs of religious controversy that good men will accept the services of villains.

Those who faced the trouble, willingly or by constraint, included three of Edward's bishops, Robert Ferrar of St. David's, Nicholas Ridley of London, and John Hooper of Gloucester and Worcester. Why it was thought worth while to burn poor Ferrar does not appear. Of similar

calibre was John Scory of Chichester, who was tolerated, and even admitted by Bonner to some sort of coadjutorship;[1] but he soon fled. Ridley and Hooper were men of another kind. Ridley is a puzzle. An ardent reformer, who showed at St. Paul's that he hoped to establish the Reformation by violent methods, he had given the new authorities ample grounds for a charge of heresy, but they preferred to lay the chief stress on the Sacrament of the altar. Regarding this he defended himself with so much subtilty that a very thin partition seems to divide him from his accusers.[2] There were, however, ample grounds for sending him to the stake, and he died nobly ; with him Hugh Latimer, who in very early days had leaned to Lutheranism at Cambridge, became a conforming Henrician bishop, resigned when the Six Articles were imposed, escaped from their rigour and was an ardent reformer in a private station. John Hooper had been a Cistercian ; he fled from the Six Articles to Zurich, returned on Edward's accession as the most uncompromising of reformers, was offered the bishopric of Gloucester but refused to wear the episcopal habit, gave way at the instance of his Swiss friends, administered his diocese with Worcester annexed in a spirit of stern discipline, was deposed on the ground of illicit marriage at Mary's accession and finally convicted of heresies unswervingly maintained.

Of the clergy below the rank of bishop surprisingly few were put on trial for heresy. There are some notable names among them, John Rogers, Rowland Taylor, John Bradford, Laurence Saunders, John Philpot. The last named had been concerned during Edward's reign in the burning of Joan Bocher, the Anabaptist " Maid of Kent," so that " he was not one," says Gairdner, " to complain of intolerance, and he did not."[3] Some laymen also suffered with credit, but the death-roll was small according to the standard of the

[1] The document is printed from the Register in Denny & Lacey, *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 149.

[2] A full report of his trial can be read in Dr. Handley Moule's book, *Bishop Ridley on the Lord's Supper*.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 369.

time. It must be remembered that no small number of persons who might have been in danger left the country during the earlier months of the reaction, and with them most of the foreigners concerned in the furtherance of reformation. Among these was Pietro-Martire Vermigli, who suffered arrest and expected worse things; he was agreeably disappointed by the reception of a passport conceived in complimentary terms. There were bewildered counsellors and divided counsels. In view of his general reputation it is strange to find King Philip urging the Queen and her advisers to abate severity. The more general persecution, which in the latter years of her reign fixed on her name an epithet which she was very far from deserving, recalls the old proceedings against Lollards, and some of the martyrs in Foxe's canon were little better than vulgar breakers of the peace.

What the Edwardian clergy did have to suffer generally was the loss of their wives. One of the earliest effects of the Reformation spread from Germany was a tendency to follow the example of Zwingli in adding the sanction of marriage to a relation which was commonly tolerated. But according to the Canon Law this was only to aggravate the offence, and the marriage contracted was null and void. As early as 1521 Henry VIII by proclamation threatened married clergymen with imprisonment in addition to canonical penances,[1] but nothing came of it until the Six Articles provided an efficient administration. Henry being removed, the Convocation of Canterbury in the first year of Edward resolved that all laws, canons and usages forbidding the marriage of priests should be made void; and the clergy hastened to act on this, though it had no canonical force. A year later Parliament supplied the necessary legal sanction. Thereupon the clergy seem to have behaved as if the permission were hortatory. When the first parliament of Mary had repealed this Act, and steps were taken to correct those who had taken advantage of it, one in five of

[1] Wilkins, *Concilia*, III, p. 696.

the whole number would seem to have been affected. A light penance was imposed ; the delinquent was usually deprived, absolved, and appointed elsewhere ; his marriage was annulled. About the consequences history is silent.

So much in general has long been known. More searching enquiries have recently been made by Mr. Geoffrey Baskerville in the records of the diocese of Gloucester,[1] where the circumstances were in no way peculiar, except that for many years before 1535 most of it had been within the charge of absentee bishops of Worcester. In the earlier part of our period he finds many cases of incontinence, sometimes very gross, on the part of the clergy, both religious and secular which were treated with astonishing leniency and even with levity. There was also a good deal of open concubinage. Marriage naturally replaced most of this after 1548, but he finds evidence of its unpopularity ; " the people seem to have preferred the old irregularities." The severe discipline of Hooper's brief episcopate has left its mark on the registers, several deprivations having been effected in his time, but there is evidence that many of such sentences were not enforced. In one year of Mary's reign fifty-four incumbents were deprived on account of marriage, but soon reinstated in other parishes. Exchanges were fairly frequent, and a priest deprived had a good chance of returning to his former charge. Let one case serve as type. Robert Lister was rector of Willersey from 1526 ; in 1554 he was deprived on account of marriage, and was followed by Thomas Hibbot, who in his turn was deprived in 1559 for pluralism, dispensed and restored in 1560 ; but in 1561 Lister once more had the rectory and held it till 1570.

Mr. Baskerville's investigations are not, of course, concerned only with the married clergy. He provides an answer to one interesting question. All chantries were suppressed in 1548, and many priests thereby lost their occupation. How were they treated ? Not badly, as the

[1] See his article in the *English Historical Review*, January, 1929, from which the following quotations are borrowed.

registers show ; " they quickly fitted into ordinary parochial life, and most of them had found posts in the diocese before the death of King Edward VI." That means that they conformed to the liturgical changes then being made. It is equally surprising to learn from Mr. Baskerville's enquiries that " doctrinal questions affected the security of tenure of the parochial clergy in a very small measure indeed." Account for it how we may, the fact remains that while Hooper was working strenuously for the Reformation, " men who were prominent as papalists in Mary's reign, as, for example, Dr. Gilbert Bourne and Dr. John Harpsfield, were still in possession of their offices." Nor was it otherwise when these men themselves were on the aggressive side ; Mary's injunctions on matters of doctrine " did not, seemingly, hit more than three of the clergymen of the diocese." During a period which has been represented as full of strenuous reformation and counter-reformation, we have the spectacle of a clergy in general completely indifferent. The Dean of the new foundation for the Cathedral set the course for the rest ; from 1541 to 1565 he was " stedfast in his attachment to whatever form of religion the government adopted." Mr. Baskerville is constrained to ask, " How had the stirring events of the preceding twenty years affected their ordinary lives ? " The answer is, " Scarcely one whit."

If the clergy were so indifferent, what of the common people ? In one part of the country it was quite another story. The commons of Devon and Cornwall rose in open rebellion against the liturgical reform of 1549. They demanded the revival of the Six Articles, the suppression of the English Service, which they likened to a Christmas game, the restoration of the Sacrament hung over the altar as formerly, and of lay communion in one kind, restricted exclusively to Easter. The revolt was quenched in blood. Contemporaneous risings in the Eastern Counties had no religious motive or pretence, and were concerned only with economic grievances of old standing. Elsewhere there was,

no doubt, questioning and excitement about the changes, but neither a hearty welcome nor concerted opposition seems to have greeted them. As in Switzerland, so here, Reformation was the work of the heads of Government. The Protector Somerset seems to have had in his curiously mixed character a strain of genuine Calvinism, probably derived from France, where he was venerated as a martyr. How he hoodwinked his royal brother-in-law, so as to obtain a dominant place among the executors of his political testament, remains a question probably unanswerable.[1] As soon as he was in the saddle the work was begun. It proved a complete failure, for obvious reasons. Wherever the Reformation made headway, it was always supported, however dictatorial in origin, by fervid preaching addressed to all sections of the people, which formed by degrees a solid basis of consent. In England preaching was severely restricted. The parochial clergy were neither competent nor trusted to proclaim novelties. Academic orators there were for State occasions, but their sound could not go out into all the land. Some hot gospellers, duly licensed, made a stir in the city of London, but in the country there was a general famine of hearing the Word of God. In the autumn of 1549 Calvin addressed an immense epistle[2] to Somerset applauding his efforts, but deploring the meagre results; the Prayer-book contained many remnants of Popery, and sad stories of moral disorder had reached Geneva. With probably unconscious irony he exhorted the great plunderer of churches to prevent a godly destruction of superstitious vanities from being made an excuse for rapine. It is a pathetic appeal, not the less so because Somerset was already fallen. But what more could the poor man do? He could not pour preachers into England as into France. The foreign Reformers who came over at Cranmer's invita-

[1] It seems impossible to accept Prof. A. F. Pollard's suggestion (*Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. II, p. 475) that Henry intended the results which followed.

[2] Dated in Beza's collection "22 Octobris MDXLVIII," but it refers to the Prayer-book of 1549 as already in use.

tion from Strassburg or Zurich, Bucer and Fagius, Vermigli and Ochino, were admirably equipped for theological disputation in the Latin tongue, but they could not preach the gospel to a barbarous people of whose language they knew nothing ; billets could be found for them in the Universities or in a prebendal stall at Canterbury, but that was the limit of their usefulness. Northumberland, whom Hooper likened to Moses and Joshua in one, leading the people of God out of the Egyptian darkness of papistry into the promised land of pure Zwinglianism, could quicken the pace of reformation by a more exhaustive pillage of church ornaments, and when he made his bold bid for a crown to place it on his young daughter-in-law's head, he was able to engage some gospellers to denounce the Lady Mary ; but his failure in that adventure led to a shameful downfall. On the scaffold he confessed his lapse into heresy and obtained absolution. It was too late for him to gain any mundane advantage, and he was certainly no coward. It seems impossible to avoid the inference that he had all along retained within his breast a belief that the Catholic religion was at least an effective device for tricking hell. One may doubt whether some popes of his time rated it much higher.

The brave men who suffered under Mary had reason for thinking that most of their former comrades, the Edwardian conformists, were returning to their vomit with an eagerness indicating a similar conviction. We may agree. The Reformation had laid no hold upon them. Older habits, and perhaps older convictions, were easily resumed ; the more easily because the officials who restored them to orthodoxy were usually in the same case. The restoration was all but universal. Some scores of exiles had carried away with them their memories, their disappointment, perhaps their hopes of a third revolution. They exhibited the usual degeneration of exiles, political or religious. Scattered, they were absorbed into the life of the reformed communities in which they found refuge ; but where gathered together, as at Strassburg and Frankfort, they

broke up into factions, furiously quarrelling and vexing the orderly soul of Calvin with appeals for moral support. Those who faced the fire at home were not all equally admirable. There is nothing like persecution for bringing out the characteristics of sheep and goats. Some were truly heroic ; Rogers and Bradford among the chief. Rogers was cheered on his way to Smithfield by a crowd which knew him well, and honoured him simply as a good, steadfast man. Bradford's letters from prison, carefully treasured and afterwards published by Coverdale, are good to read as coming from a time when scurrility was considered a proper style for religious controversy ; one in which he earnestly but vainly exhorted Lord Russell, Northumberland's lieutenant, to stand fast by the gospel is notable for its modesty and delicacy. Many of the victims, however, were but the froth or scum thrown up by every kind of public agitation, men and women who might then be reckoned fit for the pillory or the whipping-post, but whose relegation to the faggots reflected more discredit on the government than their disorderly conduct brought upon the cause to which they professed adherence.

In the *Diary of Henry Machyn*[1] we have a vivid picture of life in London from 1550 to 1563. A merchant-tailor, he was immensely interested in funeral pomps and the accompanying ceremonies, but he betrays hardly any interest even of curiosity in the religious revolutions through which he lived, and in this he probably represents the general temper of the citizens. But the sickening tale of hangings and burnings and beheadings, of disembowelling and quartering, which fills his unemotional record from 1555 onward, explains the revulsion of feeling which Mary's short reign brought about. She began by being as popular as her father had ever been ; she ended in execration. She began with a leniency as strange to the time as it was proper to her own character ; soured by disappointment, above all with her

[1] Published by the Camden Society, 1848.

marriage, she became desperate and almost ferocious. By this change she made history.

With all her popularity she could not undo at once all that had been done during the previous twenty years. Her first parliament was thoroughly Henrician, and expected her concurrence. She could never make more than a feeble attempt to restore the monastic state. Even her second parliament, consenting to reconciliation with the Papacy, would not hear of the restitution of confiscated Church property. This was both necessary and wise. It would have been disastrous from every point of view to endow the clergy afresh with anything like the vast wealth which they had formerly enjoyed and abused ; even bare-faced robbery had to be condoned, and the condonation was confirmed by a papal bull. The mischief done by Northumberland's great pillage could not be undone ; the cathedrals and parish churches of England never recovered from it ; but Machyn's descriptions show how much refurnishing was speedily effected in London, if not elsewhere.

These were limitations. What was achieved was the effective suppression of a tentative Reformation. We must no more date the English Reformation from Edward VI than from Henry VIII. The people would have none of it. The nobles burnt their fingers with it, and licked them. If Mary had been a wiser or a younger woman, the opportunity might never have recurred. England would have adhered, not to the Reformation, but to the rapidly approaching Counter-Reformation. Mary's blunders and misfortunes, culminating in the loss of Calais so soon after the brilliant victory of St. Quentin, laid the way open for a further revolution.

CHAPTER VI

THE ELIZABETHAN SETTLEMENT

WHEN the authors of the Canons of 1604 wrote of the *Ecclesia Anglicana legibus stabilita*, officially translated "the Church of England established by law," they must have had two things definitely in mind; first, the old customary law of England, usually called the Common Law, and secondly, the recent legislation of the reign of Elizabeth. The Common Law which strengthened, supported or established the Church was represented chiefly by two legal processes, the writ *de excommunicato capiendo* and the writ *de hæretico comburendo*. By the former, any person upon whom the final censure of excommunication had been pronounced by an ecclesiastical court for disregard of the authority of the Church was arrested and detained in prison until he made his submission, saving only the right of the Crown to discharge him as an act of grace. By the latter, the local sheriff was required to arrest and commit to the flames any person convicted of heresy by a competent spiritual court and not absolved on penance done. The legislation of Elizabeth added a more direct kind of support. It not only forbade nonconformity but tried to enforce active conformity. A fine of a shilling, for example, was imposed on any person absent from divine worship on Sunday; and this, given the value of money at that time, meant a cumulative penalty of serious weight for all but the wealthy.

The basis of this legal establishment was the assumption that all persons domiciled in England were Christians, and as such subject to the discipline of the Church. Jews, for example, were excluded. In other countries of western Europe they were tolerated as resident aliens, but in

England they had no right to settle on any terms, and this law was rarely subject even to evasion. There was no law expressly enforcing baptism, as at Zurich, under pain of death or banishment ; but it was taken for granted, and was probably universal. This assumption, or this fact, Richard Hooker took for the foundation of his polemic against the Calvinists, who " make a separation perpetual and personal between the Church and the commonwealth." As he saw things, " If the commonwealth be Christian, if the people which are of it do publicly embrace the true religion, this very thing doth make it the Church."[1] Calvin falsified the conclusion. He saw to it that the City of Geneva and the Church of Geneva were personally identical, neither unbeliever nor heretic being allowed to enjoy the rights of citizenship, but his theology made them essentially two distinct societies. But the English mind was impatient, then, as now, of logical distinctions, and Hooker had not occasion to ask what would be the effect on his ecclesiastical polity if the commonwealth tolerated unbelief.

Another of the same set of canons speaks of *Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ ritus ac cerimonias legibus constitutas*, and in this place the translators unfortunately used the same phrase as in the other : " the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England by law established." Hence much confusion of thought. The rites and ceremonies in question were certainly established by law, but not at all in the same sense in which the Church had for several centuries been established by law. The reference here is exclusively to the Act of Uniformity passed in the first year of Elizabeth. There was originally no other authority for the use of these rites and ceremonies. The language of the canon is quite accurate ; they were " constituted," not by any spiritual authority, but by an Act of Parliament. In Hooker's sense, but in no other sense, that Act was an act of the Church. The Book of Common Prayer so appointed by law for exclusive use was indeed accepted in practice by the spiritual authorities

[1] *Eccl. Pol.*, VIII, i, 2 ; vi. 6.

of the Church ; afterwards, but not until a hundred years later, it was formally approved by the sacred synods of the Church of England. At the time of which we are speaking it had received neither kind of approbation, but was imposed by law.

I am not at present concerned to estimate the merits or demerits of Elizabeth's actions, but only to ascertain how the Christian people of England reacted to them. To do this properly we must understand as clearly as possible what they were, and in what circumstances they were done. Hence this rather long preamble.

First, we had better ask broadly what justification can be found for them. Assuming the distinction—both Catholic and Calvinist, as we have seen—of Church and State, these actions are all acts of State, meddling arbitrarily with matters properly belonging to the Church. The distinction was hardly beginning to be understood, but our retrospective survey must take account of it. If, then, the State was to lend external support or " establishment " to the Church, it would inevitably impose some conditions. Even Calvin had to acknowledge this at Geneva. For example, if excommunicate persons were to be imprisoned, this must be done by officers of State, in England the sheriffs, and the State could not be denied the right of ascertaining that the process was conducted in accordance with the recognized principles of justice. Again, if a heretic was to be burnt, this also was the work of the sheriff ; the State could refuse to undertake it, and could not be denied the right to limit the occasions. This was actually done by Elizabeth's first parliament.[1] In short, the establishment of the Church by

[1] 1 Eliz., c. 1, § 36, provides that no errors shall be accounted heresy, " but only such as have heretofore been determined, ordered or adjudged to be heresy, by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or by the first four General Councils or any of them, or by any other General Council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said Canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be ordered, judged or determined to be heresy by the High Court of Parliament of this Realm with the assent of the Clergy in their Convocation."

law inevitably implies the possibility of some control of the Church by the legislature. Again, a law compelling attendance at divine worship is reasonable only if the legislature has power to determine what the form of that worship shall be. To " constitute " rites and ceremonies, as was done by the Act of Uniformity, to the exclusion of others previously in use, is a great stretching of that power, but not wholly irrational ; the acquiescence of spiritual authority in such an exercise of power may be cowardly, but is not nugatory.

I have described Elizabeth's work as a revolution, the third within twelve years. It had some of the usual features of revolutionary action. " A religious revolution," says the Bishop of Truro, " like any other revolution, must risk technical illegalities, and be content to do exceptional things in the confidence that the event will justify them."[1] But Elizabeth's illegalities were very few. They are not to be compared with those of the Edwardian revolutionaries, and she was even more cautious than Mary. She was, for some reason, expected to act with violence. The exiles hastened home to take part in it. Considering the state of communications, one marvels to find some of them in London within six weeks of Mary's death. They were rather coldly received. Much earlier, very few days after her accession, the Spanish ambassador, Feria, had accused her to Philip of " standing up openly against religion," though her first act had been to issue a proclamation against all innovations. Philip would not listen. He was unwilling to lose the English alliance, which had recently secured for him the decisive victories of St. Quentin and Gravelines, though it had brought on his ally the loss of Calais. Elizabeth, for her own part, needed his support against France. A very dangerous rival, as claimant of the throne, was Mary Stewart, the Queen of Scots, who was now married to the Dauphin ; and Elizabeth's own title, though good by English statute law, was worthless under the Canon Law,

[1] Frere, *The English Church in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I*, p. 39.

current through the greater part of Europe. The situation was strangely confused. By one of the ironies attendant on the Temporal Power of the Papacy, the ardent Catholic, Philip, was at war with the Pope, the ally of France. Cardinal Pole had been deprived by Paul IV of his legatine powers, and summoned to face a charge of heresy. His death, following some hours after that of Mary, removed one difficulty, and the English ambassador at Rome, Sir Edward Carne, dutifully informed the Papal Court of Elizabeth's accession. Philip was now engaged in the negotiation which led some months later to the treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis, and he tried to procure as part of the terms a papal dispensation for marriage with Elizabeth, which he seriously thought possible ; she played with the proposal in her habitual fashion, but he soon found the way closed, and consoled himself with the daughter of his French adversary. These intrigues carried the new Queen safely over the first weeks of her reign, and she began to shape her policy.

It must be recognized as her own. Some trifling outbursts of disorder showed that persecution had not stamped out all the embers of fanatical reform, at all events in London, but these were negligible. She took her own way, with much of her father's wilfulness and a good share of his ability. What she intended can be discerned behind what she did. There is no reason for supposing that she was ever troubled by any religious convictions, but she had some preferences. It seems clear that her first thought was to revive the Henrician system, without the Six Articles and the offensive title " Supreme Head of the Church." An extant paper on " Divers Points of Religion," supposed to have been written for her by a lawyer of great experience, Sir Richard Goodrich, looks that way. Much more important is a document printed by Burnet and others, consisting of answers to seven questions propounded,[1] for the suggestions were closely followed during the next few months.

[1] See Pocock's *Burnet*, Vol. V, pp. 497 *seqq.*, where the text is carefully corrected.

Perhaps for this reason they have been attributed to Sir William Cecil, Elizabeth's secretary and chief adviser. The use of the word *Interim* in this paper suggests that the writer had in mind Charles the Fifth's attempt to impose religious peace on Germany in 1548, and one feature of the Emperor's plan is reproduced, namely, the allowance of communion in both kinds for those desiring it. The difference is that Charles would have a stay of controversy until Catholicism could be everywhere restored, and Elizabeth's adviser would secure a pause until the Reformation could be resolutely pushed forward. He had no doubt that the great majority of Englishmen were attached to the " papist sect," and that ardent reformers would denounce the alterations proposed as " a cloaked papistry or a mingle-mangle." The prediction was very accurately fulfilled.

Elizabeth's path was not as smooth as Mary's had been. De Feria wrote indeed to Philip, " She is incomparably more feared than her sister was ; she gives her orders and has her way as absolutely as her father had." But this was before her intentions became manifest, and at that time all hoped for the best according to their several desires. Signs of disaffection were closely watched. John White, the Bishop of Winchester, a fierce persecutor, appeared to speak covertly against her in his sermon at Mary's funeral ; a remark about living dogs and dead lions was thought to be in bad taste, though the context was quite harmless. Some of his colleagues expostulated with him, and a brief arrest in his own house was considered a sufficient animadversion. All the bishops, however, adopted an attitude of reserve, and they were not encouraged to depart from it. Those who survived from Henry's day were well disposed to his daughter, especially Nicholas Heath, the Archbishop of York, but he resigned the Chancellorship, and was not asked to resume it ; she preferred laymen as counsellors. Those who had been promoted in Mary's reign could have no personal attachment to her, and probably all were alarmed by the first indications of intended change. Some of them

were compliant about details of ceremonial, not without significance, at the coronation; others, more unyielding, were banished from the Queen's chapel. It was evident that a new spirit was in them, and they would not be as malleable as their predecessors had been under her father's hand.

At the other pole of opinion the returning exiles suffered much disappointment. They found strict restraints put on preaching, and the churches closed against them, the authorities conniving only at some conventicles in private houses. Not until after the coronation on January 15 were their voices heard in public. Ten days later, at the opening of Parliament, Dr. Coxe, formerly Dean of Westminster, delivered a long discourse in the Abbey Church, where he was relieved to find that the customary Mass of the Holy Ghost had been sung at an earlier hour, and he had to take part only in the English Litany of Henrician days, which had escaped legal proscription in the last reign. He was allowed, without rebuke, to be indiscreet in his references to the present state of religion, and to the work that lay before Parliament. On Ash Wednesday, February 8, Machyn notes that he again preached before the Queen, and during the next seven days he was followed by Scory and David Whitehead. The last named, one of the more intransigent among the exiles, was ultimately distinguished as a Non-conformist, and died in 1571, shortly after testifying to the truth that was in him by marrying at the age of eighty a youthful widow.[1] Among these Lenten preachers, Matthew Parker, the future Archbishop, also appears for the first time.

Elizabeth's intentions were no longer veiled. In the parliament, thus inaugurated, the Commons were on the whole amenable to the influence of the Court, but in the Upper House the lay lords were divided and the bishops, with the Abbot of Westminster, formed a solid opposition. Their numbers were seriously depleted. A reader of Machyn's Diary can calculate the ravages of the pestilence

[1] *Zurich Letters*, p. 242.

which men called the Sweat during the last year of Mary's reign, and it took heavy toll of the episcopate. Nor were vacancies filled, strained relations with the Pope probably hindering promotions. From November, 1557, to December, 1559, no bishop was consecrated in England. Tunstall was disabled by age; Thirlby was in France negotiating the treaty of peace. The result was that the bishops never mustered more than nine at any division of this critical session. The first legislative measures restored the Henrician position complete, except that the title of Supreme Head was omitted, and the limitation of heresy, mentioned above, was incorporated into the Act of Supremacy.

More serious things remained to be done, and it was not until April 18 that the Bill "for the Uniformity of Common Prayer and Service in the Church, and Administration of the Sacraments" was introduced. There had been a Disputation of divines on the subject in the presence of the parliament, which was better managed by the reformers than by the bishops, who wished to take their stand too positively as in possession of the ground. In the Queen's chapel there had been experiments at Easter, the nature of which has not been completely explored. There had been a proposal to revive the first Prayer-book of Edward VI, against which the exiles strongly protested. They had their way. The Bill provided for the revival of the second Prayer-book, with slight but not unimportant modifications looking back to its predecessor. It was passed by a small majority in the House of Lords, and received the royal assent on May 8. In the earlier part of the session the Convocation of Canterbury had pronounced emphatically against all the changes made or proposed, and its protest was ignored. All that was done had the authority only of Crown and Parliament. With that the exiles were content; they were steeped in the traditions of Zurich, and at Zurich, as we have seen, the Reformation was the work of the magistracy. With the details of the change they were less satisfied, but

they openly triumphed. By historic parity we must say that the Reformation in England began with the legislation of Elizabeth's first Parliament.

This legislation is commonly called the Elizabethan Settlement. Subsequent events justify the description, but nothing in history ever looked less like a settlement at the time of making. Elizabeth's own position was insecure, as we have seen, and of this she was soon to be reminded. The Dauphin Francis and Mary Stewart had on the occasion of their marriage quartered the arms of England with those of France and Scotland. That was merely an heraldic gesture, pardonable on the ground that Mary was incontestably heir presumptive in line of legitimacy to the English throne. But on the death of Henry II in July, 1559, they had themselves proclaimed King and Queen of France, Scotland and England. That was an immediate claim put forward. True, Elizabeth had herself been proclaimed Queen of France, and ordinarily bore the title ; but that was confessedly no more than a picturesque archaism ; this might at any time mean business. If Mary did not press her claim, there were none the less others who might push it, and nothing but Elizabeth's life stood in the way. Until the axe fell at Fotheringhay she was never quite free from the risk of assassination. In the earlier years, at all events, her death would have meant the crumbling of her work ; what else it is hard to say.

In the second place there was an outstanding difficulty about the episcopate. What the legislature had settled on paper required bishops for its realization. But the bishops in possession showed no signs of lending their aid ; they might rather be counted on to raise obstacles. The Queen and her advisers may have expected some of them to conform after making an adequate protest ; their past history certainly encouraged the hope. But they showed a new spirit, an independence unlike anything that had been seen since Fisher gave his life in protest against Henry's claim of supremacy. An attempt had been made by a Bill in

Parliament to restore to their Sees the bishops who were arbitrarily removed by Mary. This would have brought back Barlow to Bath and Wells, Scory to Chichester, and Coverdale to Exeter ; but it was not passed, nor apparently even pressed. What the existing bishops would do was anxiously awaited. The Supremacy Act imposed an oath of adhesion to its provisions, to be taken on demand by all persons holding office in the Church or under the Crown : anyone refusing it was thereby to vacate his office. A brief delay was allowed the bishops, and of some, at least, compliance was expected. On May 23rd the administration of the oath was committed to a number of prominent laymen. On the next five days Machyn observed with curiosity that Bonner was entertaining at his palace the French ambassadors who had arrived for the confirmation of the peace recently negotiated ; on the 29th he heard that the bishop had refused the oath and was deposed. It would seem that every effort was made to retain him. The old Henrician, a man after Henry's own heart, might be expected to conform. The Commissioners paused, and left the other bishops alone for three weeks. Then they were put to the proof, and before the end of June seven more had refused compliance, Things began to look serious. Without bishops the newly enacted laws would be inoperative. One of the abortive Bills of the late session had provided for the appointment of bishops by the Crown without any rite or ceremony, a device borrowed from Christian IV of Denmark ; most of the exiles would probably have welcomed it, but there was no other support. New bishops must be found, and above all an Archbishop of Canterbury, to put things in order. On July 18th a *congé d'élire* was sent to the Dean and Chapter of the metropolitical church, Matthew Parker being nominated for election. If this seems long delayed, we must remember that it could not be done until the Henrician procedure was revived. More delay may have been caused by the absence of the Dean, Nicholas Wooton, busy with diplomatic work

in France. This unflinching conformist, who served the Church with equal zeal under Cranmer, Pole and Parker, put through the election on the first of August ; six of the prebendaries appointed by Pole were absent, the other four placed their votes in the hands of the dean, and Parker was unanimously elected.[1] He was now Archbishop elect, but he could not take charge until his election was confirmed and he was consecrated. The mode of these two actions was precisely defined in the Henrician statute so lately revived. There must be found within the Queen's dominions either an archbishop and two bishops or else four bishops to do this necessary thing. The old canons of the Church did not require so much, but the new law of the realm required it, and it would be intolerable for the new archbishop to lack those very sanctions of law for lack of which existing bishops were being removed. It would be fatal for Elizabeth and her advisers to fall into the pit which they had digged for others. Where should the requisite consecrators be found ? Heath, the not unfriendly Archbishop of York, had refused the oath and been removed.

By September there were only five left ; two Henricians, the aged Tunstall and Anthony Kitchen of Llandaff, and three Marians, Gilbert Bourne of Bath, David Poole of Peterborough, and Thomas Stanley of Sodor and Man. Two new elections had been effected, of Barlow to Chichester and of Scory to Hereford ; these were consecrated bishops, but as yet only bishops-elect of their new dioceses and therefore of doubtful availability for the purpose. Nevertheless it was resolved to make use of them. On September 9th a commission was issued to these six, omitting Stanley probably as inaccessible, to confirm and consecrate. Tunstall, Bourne and Poole, after some hesitation, declined ; the oath was then tendered to them and refused. They were promptly deposed. Machyn, recording no doubt the gossip of the city, noted that Tunstall's deposition was

[1] The full record of the election *per compromissum* is in Denny and Lacey, *De Hierarchia*, pp. 201–7.

effected on the eve of Michaelmas, "be-cause he should not reseyffe the rentes for that quarter." The old man did not lose much; within two months he was dead.

The whole scheme had now broken down. There was, indeed, a possibility which seems to have been strangely neglected. Hugh Curwen, the Archbishop of Dublin, was a consistent conformist, being translated in 1567 to the See of Oxford, and he seems to have been a personal friend of Parker. There were others in Ireland equally accommodating. Why they were not brought over for the purpose does not appear. The Government was indeed in a desperate strait, and desperate measures were adopted. We may recall the political truth that a revolution can seldom be carried through without some illegalities. Cecil and Parker pondered over the difficulty.[1] Fortified by an opinion of six Doctors of Law, one of whom had been Thirlby's Vicar-General at Ely, Cecil at length resolved, on December 6th, to issue a commission to seven available bishops, with an ominous clause purporting to supply by the Queen's supreme authority all that might be lacking in their capacity according to ecclesiastical law or the statutes of the realm.[2] The seven were Kitchen, of Llandaff; Barlow, elect of Chichester; Scory, elect of Hereford; Coverdale, formerly of Exeter; John Bale, formerly of Ossory in Ireland, whence he had been removed by Mary; and two suffragans, Hodgekyn, of Bedford, and Salisbury, of Thetford. All were genuine bishops duly consecrated, four Henrician, three Edwardian, and therefore canonically competent to consecrate another bishop, but Kitchen was the only one actually in possession of a See, and therefore the only one legally competent to confirm Parker's election and proceed to his consecration. The "supplentes" clause was evidently needed. Whether it had any legal effect is another

[1] Strype, *Life of Matthew Parker*, p. 40.

[2] The text of this "supplentes" clause may be read in *Rymer*, xv, p. 549, or Denny and Lacey, *De Hierarchia*, p. 11.

question, of which Bonner made effective use three years later.[1]

It has been argued that Barlow, Scory, and Coverdale had been uncanonically removed by Mary, and therefore were still canonically in possession of their Sees. The facts are disputable in all three cases; were they perfectly assured, they could not be urged by men who had just been removing bishops in the same manner, nor would they diminish the illegality of the procedure adopted. The revolutionaries set at naught their own rules, and the Settlement was made the more precarious. Parker was consecrated in a way neither canonical nor legal. The legal flaw was mended by an Act of Parliament in 1563; the canonical defect was remedied only by long and undisputed possession.

A further weakness was due to the attitude of the exiles. In their eyes what had been done was at best a step in the right direction. They had little regard for episcopacy, and most of them would gladly have seen it disappear. Jewel, who was to be the most learned champion of the revolution, arrived in London near the end of March, fifty-seven days out from Zurich, and began to send thither a series of letters addressed to Bullinger and Vermigli, in which he poured out his hopes, his fears and his disappointments. He thinks enviously of the Marian vigour: "Our adversaries were headlong in everything, regardless of precedent or legal rights; we are nothing if not circumspect, prudent, deliberate, wary; as if God could not hold his own without our regulations and safeguards. . . . The delay has weakened us and strengthened our furious opponents more than one could believe. . . . And yet the people everywhere, and especially the nobles, hate their insolence and are wonderfully athirst for the Gospel." So he sways in judgment, careless of consistency. A little later he hears that the Queen is meditating an alliance with the Lutheran princes, and somebody in Germany has written to say that nothing

[1] *Infra*, p. 90.

of the kind will be thought of if she invites Vermigli to England. " We have explained to her our doctrine and practice, without the slightest departure from the Zurich standards . . . but so far not a pennyworth of provision has been made for any of us."

Later again, " We are as foreigners in our own country. Then why not come back to Zurich ? Oh ! that I could ! for there seems to be no chance of bringing you to England. O Zurich ! how much more I think of you now than I ever thought of England when I was at Zurich ! . . . We are now busy with sacred theatricals ; what you and I used to laugh at is being gravely discussed, by whom I know not (for we are not consulted), as if Christianity could not stand without trappings. We do not play with such trumpery. Others affect a golden mean, which I call leaden." On the first of August there is something new. Some of the exiles are at last to be given bishoprics, " and I, the least of the apostles, am offered Salisbury, but that is a burden that I have quite decided to shake off my shoulders." Writing to another correspondent three months later he is delighted to say that the revenues of bishops are to be cut down, so that they may be no more than humble pastors.[1] But within six months he will have shouldered the burden, bearing it not without credit. He was not alone, either in his protestation or in his surrender. Some were more obstinate, and sorely vexed the mediating soul of Parker. To them and their later followers we shall return. I mention them here only as showing that the stability of the new order was threatened from two opposing sides.

The Elizabethan settlement, then, looks at first sight rather like a perilous adventure. For a hundred years it encountered a succession of violent storms, of fierce controversy, of political animosity, and finally of civil war. For the first twenty years almost submerged under contempt, it was lifted to respect by the administration of Whitgift and the philosophic theology of Hooker ; thence it

[1] *Zurich Letters*, Latin texts, pp. 9, 11, 13, 23, 29.

was carried on by a succession of great divines and a King who really believed in it, only to be laid prostrate as if irretrievably shattered by the blows of triumphant sectaries ; defended and justified in that state as little more than a memory by a faithful remnant, it appeared resurgent to be accepted with its merits and its faults by an overwhelming majority of the nation, and treated with excessive veneration until the time was come for more critical estimates, and an endeavour to sift out the good from the evil. For good or for evil, for acceptance or rejection, for maintenance or amendment, we must date the English Reformation from that first year of Elizabeth. A reversal of it is impossible.

CHAPTER VII

THE RECUSANTS

IT may be doubted whether anyone heartily welcomed this English Reformation. There were certainly many who thought it was a storm that would soon pass by, as others had recently done. These might be either acquiescent or defiant. They had been practising acquiescence for more than twenty years, and could not easily break the habit. On the other hand the returned exiles thought it the poor beginning of an unfinished work which they must push to completion. The only man of any account who seems to have had any feeling of present satisfaction is Matthew Parker. He was unquestionably a Reformer, but a reformer of an unusual type. Most of the reformers whose work we have been considering could hardly bring themselves to speak of their unreformed predecessors as Christians. When Jewel said that his Edwardian contemporary at Oxford, Thomas Harding, had " apostatized " under Mary, the hard word was perhaps only a handy missile of abuse, in hurling which he conveniently forgot his own temporary abjuration of the same date ; but he could hardly have used it had he not subconsciously regarded the Catholic Church of past ages as an unchristian institution from which he had broken away to make a new beginning. Compare with this the tone of the book *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*, in which some readers have doubtfully discerned Matthew Parker's own hand, and which was certainly published with his approval three years before his death. Here he is represented as continuing a long line of archbishops, and in particular as the immediate and lawful successor of Cardinal Pole. In this comparison appear two contrasting aspects

of the English Reformation. On the one hand it was deeply indebted to the Continental movement. Lutheranism was reflected in the authority ascribed to the reigning prince, and to some extent in the ordering of Divine worship ; the active reformers were inspired and directed from Zurich and in a less degree from Geneva, gratefully acknowledging their indebtedness. On the other hand it differed profoundly from that movement in two important respects. First, it retained the whole hierarchy, the two Hierarchies of Order and of Jurisdiction, which were abandoned alike in Saxony, in Switzerland, and by all Calvinists. These were retained, it must be allowed, with their worst features intact ; non-residence, pluralists, the misuse of inquisition and of excommunication in the spiritual courts ; all the abuses, in fact, which made Calvin a Reformer and supplied material alike for his fiercest invective and for the jibes of scurrilous satirists. Good and evil manifestly showed the old Church partially cleansed. In the second place no use was made of the Confessions, the Augustana and the Helvetica, which with Calvin's Great Catechism had become the standards of the Reformation. The Forty-two Articles of 1553 were not revived ; no new definitions were attempted except the limitation of punishable heresy ;[1] the Thirty-nine Articles were to appear before long, but for the present the only available standards of doctrine were the *lex orandi* and the traditional teaching of the Church. It is not surprising that men of conservative habit could passively accommodate themselves once more to a change imposed by authority.

It has been said in vivid metaphor that " the Catholic Church in England bifurcated in the sixteenth century."[2] If it be Catholic to hold fast a traditional relation to parish priest and diocesan bishop, a prescribed attendance at Divine worship in the familiar church, the recitation of familiar creeds and the use of familiar sacraments, then the people who acquiesced in the new order might reasonably

[1] *Supra*, p. 63.
[2] Mackenzie, *The Confusion of the Churches*, p. 91.

be accounted Catholic. If, again, it be Catholic to hold by a definite conception of the hierarchy which has been taught and received for centuries past, a prescript form of worship familiar from childhood and of venerable antiquity, religious habits and observances not less fixed by usage and customably regarded as normal elements of the Christian life, then those who rejected the innovations imposed and refused communion with those who followed them had at least an equal right to claim the Catholic name. Irrefutable evidence shows that an overwhelming majority of the clergy and people of England belonged by choice or compulsion to the former class. There is equally good evidence to prove that a considerable minority of the clergy and a smaller minority of the people belonged to the latter class. There was a bifurcation of Catholicity.

Ardent reformers vigorously asserted that they themselves were Catholic, and practised the true Catholic religion. They argued this on antiquarian grounds, as when Jewel challenged all the scholars of the world to show that any of the practices which they had abandoned were prevalent in the Catholic Church during the first six centuries. He won a cheap dialectical victory over Thomas Harding, who accepted the challenge and proved little more than his own incapacity to appreciate the subtlety with which it was framed. But where Jewel failed was in the tacit assumption, to which Harding was blind, that the Catholic Church was incapable of development, of producing things new as well as treasuring things old. The assumption really involved all that was veiled in his mention of Harding's "apostasy," the conclusion that for nine hundred years Christendom had been progressively ceasing to be Christian, that the Catholic Church had ceased to exist and must be fashioned anew. It is difficult for anyone who has a regard for history to allow him any use of the Catholic name.

He had followers who became known as Puritans. These will have to engage our attention later. Here it must suffice to observe that we have noted one class of active Reformers,

and two classes of Catholics, those who acquiesced in the Reformation and those who set themselves firmly against it. The latter came to be called Recusants. The word had reference at first to the refusal of the Oath of Supremacy, but acquired a larger significance. These men are our present concern.

In the first instance, the persons from whom the Oath could be required were: "All and every Archbishop, Bishop, and all and every other ecclesiastical person, and other ecclesiastical officer and minister, of what estate, dignity, preheminence or degree soever he or they be, or shall be, and all and every Temporal Judge, Justice, Mayor and other Lay or Temporal officer and minister."[1] The penalty for refusing the Oath was immediate deprivation of office. The administration of the oath, however, was discretionary, and some officials who seemed to be harmless, even in high places, were passed over. Sir Anthony Browne, for example, was Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas at Mary's death; he was reduced to the rank of puisne judge and sat on the bench till his death in 1567, "having always lived a R. Catholic," says Anthony Wood.[2] Kitchen, the Bishop of Llandaff, is said to have refused the oath, undertaking to impose it on his clergy, and he was left undisturbed. Of the other bishops who refused, Goldwell and Pate, old familiars of Cardinal Pole, left the country and afterwards took part in the final sessions of the Council of Trent. The rest were let alone for some months, but in April 1560, Bonner got into trouble for "declaiming and railing" against the new order,[3] and under another provision of the Act of Supremacy was confined in the Marshalsea. Seven others were on like charges committed to the Tower or to the Fleet. Poole alone remained at liberty and kept quiet. The rest of the clergy were taken in hand by the Royal Visitors, all pronounced reformers,

[1] 1 Eliz., cap. 1, § 19.
[2] *Athen. Oxon.*, fo. 153.
[3] So Jewel, *Zurich Letters*, p. 79.

who scoured the country in the old Edwardian style, acting under the vague powers of the Supremacy, enforcing the Queen's Injunctions, and sometimes exceeding in their zeal the express requirements even of these. Open resistance there was not ; the doctrine of passive obedience had been for more than twenty years hammered into the minds of the English people, formerly so lightly policed, and the Marian severity had been the last addition to make an easy task for those who reversed its intention. Opinions were not proscribed, as long as they were held in silence, and there seems to have been no inquisition regarding them, but there was no freedom of speech ; disputation, whether as truculent as Bonner's may have been or of the soberest description, was forbidden by the statute under cumulative penalties mounting to those for treason. How many of the clergy unwillingly acquiesced in the changes we have no means of knowing. How many were recalcitrant to the extent of refusing the oath it is hard to say, for there are imperfect records, but it appears from these that they did not amount to many hundreds. Willing or unwilling, acquiescence was general.

The exiles, however, were not happy. We can read their inmost thoughts in letters addressed to their friends and advisers at Zurich. Coxe, now Bishop of Ely, assured Vermigli that " the popish priests among us are daily relinquishing their ministry, lest, as they say, they should be compelled to give their sanction to heresies." But he adds : " Our enemies are many and mighty." Two years later he has to confess : " There is everywhere an immense number of papists, though for the most part concealed. They have been quiet hitherto, except that they are cherishing their errors in their secret assemblies." At the end of 1563 he wrote to Cecil : " Hosius' books fly abroad in all corners, *unica gloriatio omnium papistarum*, who swarm in all corners, saying and doing almost what they list." Sandys, soon after becoming Bishop of Worcester, was alarmed at a spirit of compromise, which moved the Queen

to forbid the return of Vermigli to England: "The cause of Christ has always many adversaries, and the best persons are always the worse spoken of. This pretence of unity is daily giving rise to many divisions." One can almost see that he has Parker in mind. Parkhurst, after much protestation that he would not hear of it, was made Bishop of Norwich. Some months later he writes complacently to Bullinger: "Many pious persons are quite satisfied; as for myself, a few things still remain unsatisfactory, but I hope for an improvement." A year later he is "occupied whole days together in the discovery and extirpation of errors and irregularities." Another year passes, and "there are in England many good and zealous men; there are many too cold, and not a few lukewarm, whom the Lord will spue out of his mouth. But, to be plain with you, I fear many evils are hanging over our heads." Then he becomes almost desperate: "There is no truth, no liberality, no knowledge of God." He receives, however, a letter from the Archbishop: "The substance of it is this, that I should diligently ascertain by every means in my power, though secretly, who and how many there are in my diocese who do not comply with the true religion. This is, I suspect, with the intention of punishing their breach of faith. I shall carefully attend to this." The good man evidently had no scruples about the method of inquisition, as practised under canon law. He is much relieved to gather that "his grace of Canterbury intends firmly to support the true religion," a point evidently in doubt, and he piously aspires, "May the Lord grant it!" With a side glance at what is done in the Queen's chapel he laments, "the lukewarmness of some persons very much retards the progress of the gospel." Jewel, almost always optimistic, is delighted with the spread of psalm-singing after the Huguenot fashion—Sternhold and Hopkins, to wit—in his diocese of Salisbury. He reluctantly allows that "many things are tolerated by sovereigns by reason of times," but this must not go on: "Now that the full light of the gospel has shone forth, the

very vestiges of error must, as far as possible, be removed together with the rubbish." He instances the surplice. In the same letter he sighs after more vigorous times : " The Marian bishops are still confined in the tower, and are going on in their old way. If the laws were but as rigorous now as in the time of Henry, they would submit themselves without difficulty. They are an obstinate and untamed set of men, but are nevertheless subdued by terror and the sword." He was perhaps thinking of More and Fisher, but it seems odd that he should not reflect how certainly his own choice in Henry's day would have been between abjuration and the faggots, with a probability that even abjuration would not have saved him from the alternative. Two more may be quoted, Thomas Sampson, who resisted the allurement of a bishopric, and Thomas Lever, who was not offered one. They were the less compromised. Sampson writes to Bullinger four years after the reformation settlement : " The affairs of England are in a most unhappy state ; I apprehend yet worse evils, not to say the worst." This was, no doubt, the complete restoration of popery. Lever, an Edwardian preacher at Coventry, escaped from the persecution there and returned as soon as the way was open, to anticipate the future development of Independency and form a congregation about which he writes to Bullinger, who would not be likely to approve, " We are not bound to each other, neither I to the townsmen nor they to me, by any law or engagement, but only by free kindness and love." Looking about him from this citadel, he observed that " the prebendaries in the cathedrals, and the parish priests in the other churches, retaining the outward habits and inward feeling of popery, so fascinate the eyes and ears of the multitude, that they are unable to believe but that either the popish doctrine is still retained, or at least that it will shortly be restored."[1]

These writers were good and earnest men, who professed

[1] The passages above quoted will be found in *Zurich Letters*, pp. 71–130. I have used here the translations of the Editor.

an almost unbounded belief in the efficacy of preaching, but for the establishment of the Reformation they looked to "terror and the sword." The truth is that they were themselves terrified, and with good reason. A reaction might sweep them away. It had happened before, as they well remembered, and it might happen again. Elizabeth's position did not improve during her first four years. Her strength lay in the nature of her title to the Crown, which was peculiarly English, resting exclusively on an Act of Parliament. It had nothing to do with the legitimacy of which the Pope and Cranmer had concurrently deprived her. Her best chance of recovering that lay in the possible friendliness of the Pope, which Philip hoped to procure for her. In a high spirit of adventure she deliberately refused the chance, and held by her native title. There were rivals on the score of legitimacy, but the danger was diminished by their number, for there were scions of the House of York in existence, as well as the Queen of Scots and her cousin, Darnley. Maitland has acutely said that "Elizabeth's statutory title stood between England and Wars of the Roses, which would also be wars of religion."[1] These things were not much talked about, but neither were they forgotten. The proclamation of Francis and Mary as King and Queen of France, Scotland and England, in July, 1559, was almost a declaration of war, but Elizabeth countered it by keeping the peace formally with France and sending aid to the Calvinist lords in Scotland who were fighting against the French domination of their country. The enforced surrender of the foreign garrison at Leith settled that business. But in December, 1560, Francis died, and Mary, having no more place in France, became by that very loss a more possible claimant of the English crown. In the following summer she took the bold step of returning to her rebellious kingdom, where she made no attempt to displace the triumphant Calvinists, but insisted on practising her own religion. As Queen of France she had promised in the treaty

[1] *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. II, p. 560.

of Edinburgh to call herself no longer Queen of England. Ceasing to be Queen of France, she might hold that promise void. In any case she was in the right line of succession. On this account her marriage to the worthless boy Darnley, so miserable in its consequences, was admirable in policy, for it united two lines of descent from Henry VII. Being what she was and where she was, she inevitably became the main hope of the Recusants.

The hope was at once a stimulus and a check. The Zurich letters which we have been considering show that they became rather less passive. On the other hand they had the less need of movement, for relief might come to them without any effort on their part. In the autumn of 1562 Elizabeth was ill with the smallpox, and a letter of Jewel's strikes the note of alarm. "She had almost lost her life," he wrote, "through her impatience of the fever and the wearisomeness. But we thank God, who has delivered her from danger and us from fear." It was not Mary only that he feared, but Darnley also. "There is a certain noble lady," he had written some months earlier, "the lady Margaret, a niece of Henry VIII, and one who is beyond measure hostile to religion, more violent indeed than even Queen Mary herself. The crown, it is surmised, will descend to her son, a young man of eighteen, should anything happen to Elizabeth, which God forbid! The husband of this woman, the Scottish Lenox, has within these few days been committed to the Tower. The son, they say, is either carried away by his mother, or has taken refuge in Scotland. There are, as is usually the case, various reports respecting him. The Queen of Scotland is, as you know, unmarried, so that a matrimonial alliance may possibly be formed between them. However this be, it is believed that the papists are planning some scheme or other, and expecting something, I know not what, no less than the Jews do their Messiah." There was, however, another possibility. The Lady Catharine Grey, sister of the unhappy Jane, was reported to have a child, whether legitimate or not was

uncertain, by the Earl of Hertford, son of the Protector Somerset, and this child might come to the throne by the will of Henry VIII. Such a catching at straws shows the extent of his anxiety. "Oh! how wretched are we," he exclaims, "who cannot tell under what sovereign we are to live! God will, I trust, long preserve Elizabeth to us in life and safety, and that will satisfy us."[1] It was clear, even to this most sanguine of men, that the continuance of the Reformation hung on the life of Elizabeth. It had not yet taken hold of the people, as it had in Scotland.

Elizabeth knew that she could not hope to oust Mary from the succession. She had probably been for some time aware also that she was incapable of bearing children. There seems to be no other explanation of the bitter cry wrung from an otherwise healthy young woman of little more than thirty, "The Queen of Scots hath a fair son, and I am a barren stock!" She must therefore prolong her days, if her work was not to be undone, and she went in peril. Persecution breeds fanatics, and mild as was the treatment of the Recusants, one of them might be goaded to the remedy of assassination. Yet her fine spirit scorned even ordinary precautions. What was needed was the building up of a Reformed Church comparable with that which was facing Mary in Scotland. Something was done in the Convocation of 1563, where about a third of the lower house consisted of Marian clergy now conforming; the Thirty-nine Articles in their earliest form were approved, and certainly made for comprehensiveness, though hardly calculated to win obstinate Recusants. An attempt was made to revise the Prayer-book in the direction desired by the less violent reformers, but this was defeated by a bare majority. Simultaneously in Parliament drastic things were done. The obligation of the Oath of Supremacy was much more widely extended, and a new crime was invented. Any one who should "by writing, cyphering, printing, preaching

[1] *Zurich Letters*, pp. 102–3 and 124. The words "it is believed" are not quite exact, the Latin being "credibile est."

or teaching, deed or act, advisedly and wittingly, hold or stand with to extol, set forth, maintain or defend the authority, jurisdiction, or power of the Bishop of Rome, or of his See, heretofore claimed, used or usurped within this Realm," should for the first offence incur the dangers of *præmunire*, and for a second offence the pains of high treason. The same pains were attached to refusal of the oath.[1] Thus was revived Henry's legislation about " verbal treason," which had been repealed as intolerable by Edward's first parliament, and thereto was added a further kind of treason, committed by keeping silence. A vigorous inquisition was provided for the detection of these crimes, and a reign of terror seemed to be imminent.

It hung fire ; but here was the beginning of those Penal Laws which were to be for a century and a half the disgrace of English law. Worse things yet were to be done, by which Recusants were goaded into the Powder Plot, a field was prepared for the crimes of Oates and Dangerfield, and Ireland was reduced to a permanent state of rebellion. It might seem that the intention was to exterminate papists in act or in heart ; but it is not easy to massacre the half or a third of a population by process of law. Their persistence proves the hostile reaction of a large part of the English people to the Reformation. They dwindled. It is difficult to accept Mr. Belloc's estimate of their numbers at various times, but there were enough of them to play an important part in the Civil War, and he may be right in thinking that the panic of the Popish Plot was not quite so absurd as it seems. In the course of another hundred years they became a feeble remnant. So too, the powerful Huguenot minority perished out of France. Persecution does not always stand condemned by failure.[2]

[1] 5 Eliz., cap. 1, §§ 2, 8, 10 and 11.

[2] *A list of the Roman Catholics in the County of York in* 1604, edited in 1872 by Mr. Edward Peacock, F.S.A., contains the names of more than three thousand persons, many of them " poor farm labourers, servant maids, tailors and fishermen," living in a part only of the county, which was then very thinly peopled. It appears to be an official return.

The Recusants were further to be wounded by those of their own house. The policy of the Papal Court in the face of things happening in England was singularly confused. We must remember that relations had been strained for some time before Mary's death.[1] The character of Paul IV and his fierce enmities made it inevitable. This remarkable man must engage our attention for a moment. Giovanni Pietro Caraffa was a Neapolitan, born in 1476, who contracted in his youth two lifelong passions ; a bitter hatred of the Spaniards who dominated his country, and a nobler but not less bitter detestation of the abuses from which the Church was suffering. In middle life he gathered some kindred spirits in the " Oratory of Divine Love," and afterwards founded the religious order of Theatines, with the double function of combating heresy and furthering a moral reformation. Paul III, himself a conspicuous example of the detested abuses, drew these men to him on his accession to the Papacy in 1534. Among the first cardinals created were Caraffa and his intimate friends, the Venetian senator, Contarini, and the young Englishman, Reginald Pole. It is significant that these two were not in holy orders. Morone was soon added to their number. They were not afraid of talking about reformation, and produced a notable document, " Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia," followed by another, " Consilium . . . super Reformatione sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ," which dealt with the innermost concerns of the Holy See. Contarini conducted the Colloquy of Ratisbon in 1541, which awakened the conciliating powers of Bucer and filled the soul of Calvin with alarm. But now Caraffa parted from his friends, and was soon accusing them of a dangerous approximation to Lutheranism. He was flexible in practical reform, adamant in doctrine, and drew the Pope after him. In 1545 Pole was appointed to open the Council of Trent, but with two most uncongenial colleagues. At the Conclave of 1549 Pole came within sight of election, but Caraffa, the veteran

[1] *Supra*, pp. 65, 68.

purifier of the Church, threw his weight on the side of Cardinal del Monte, who summed up in himself and exceeded the vices of all recent pontiffs. Naming himself Julius III, this belated survival from the Renaissance began by bestowing a Cardinal's hat on his minion, a wretched boy of seventeen, disposed of Pole as Legate to England, and did not much else in an inglorious reign of five years. Caraffa himself succeeded as Paul IV. Leaving the work of government to three worthless nephews, who accumulated all the evils which it had been his life work to abate, he gave himself up to the pursuit of real or imaginary heretics, threw Morone into prison, and treated the affairs of England as we have seen. At the crisis of Elizabeth's accession he discovered the practices of his nephews and was thrown into a paroxysm of rage and penitence, from which he never entirely recovered, dying in August, 1559. Not until December 28th was another election effected. Thus for more than a year the English Recusants were left to their own devices.

The new Pope, Pius IV, was a man of very different character, gentle and conciliatory. He wrote to Elizabeth as to a dear daughter, and she managed to learn the contents of the letter without admitting the bearer into the country. A year later came a much more important missive, which was delivered. The sessions of the Council of Trent were to be resumed, and Elizabeth was invited as a Christian sovereign to send representatives. An exciting game of cross-purposes began, being perhaps not much more than manœuvring for position. Philip, still professing friendliness, instructed his ambassador, Quadra, to press for a favourable reply from Elizabeth. She affected a grievance because she was not treated in exactly the same way as other Catholic princes. Lord Robert Dudley assured the ambassador that she would consent, hinting that he might himself represent her. Philip wrote urging her to release the Marian bishops and let them go to the Council, and in view of it to suspend all proceedings against the Recusants. The last

suggestion bore some fruit. The Queen-Mother of France was consulted about the possibility of insisting that the Council should meet north of the Alps. Cecil had long discussions with Quadra, proposed an interview with the Archbishop of Canterbury, which Parker declined for fear of offending his colleagues, raised the old questions about the relation of the Council to the Pope, and insisted that the new English bishops, being canonically ordained, must be put on an equality with the rest. All seemed to be going well, when on May 5th the ambassador received a note stating that the Queen could not recognize the proposed Council because it was to be a continuation of the sessions held at Trent, about which she had not been advised.[1] A paper of the same date which was in Cecil's hands contains the instructions given to the French representatives at the Council for pressing drastic reforms in the Church and for maintaining the liberties of the Gallican Church.[2]

These proceedings inspired the Recusants with hopes which were strengthened by persistent reports that the English Prayer-book would receive at least some measure of recognition, so that they might with a good conscience discharge the statutory obligation of attendance at church. They were soon undeceived. Elizabeth had probably got all that she wanted, for after these negotiations it would hardly be possible to call in question her title. But when the work of the Council was finished, a new attack of another kind might be expected, and she armed herself for it by the legislation of two years later, which we have been considering.

The new penalties were first applied to Bonner, with a surprising result. He lay in the Marshalsea, which was within the diocese of Winchester. The Bishop, an exile named Robert Horn, was instructed to tender him the Oath

[1] See the *Calendar of Letters and State Papers relating to English Affairs, preserved principally in the Archives of Simancas*, Vol. I, Elizabeth, 1561, January to May.

[2] S.P. Foreign, 1561–2; n. 1046. See also Throckmorton's despatches, nn. 924 and 1013.

of Supremacy, which would soon bring him within the new law of treason. He refused it, alleging that Horn was not a lawfully consecrated bishop, and therefore not qualified to administer it. He proved himself once more a good lawyer. One of his points was that the Edwardian Ordinal, by which all the new bishops were consecrated, had been made unlawful by Mary's legislation, and had not been legalized afresh. This was incontestable, and the defect could not be made good until Parliament was once more in session. This did not happen until 1566, when a declaratory act was passed. Other persons could be commissioned to administer the oath, but the regular procedure was put out of gear, and it would not be wise to call attention to the fact. Bonner was therefore left undisturbed in the Marshalsea until his death in 1569.

Elsewhere the new legislation, when put in force, disclosed a wider extent of recusancy than was suspected. Especially was this the case in the University of Oxford, where many fellows of colleges were expelled for persistent evasion of the law. More widely also it produced a new emigration of exiles, of whom William Allen, afterwards Cardinal, and Thomas Stapleton were the most conspicuous. Louvain was at first their favourite refuge, but in 1568 Allen founded the famous English college at Douai, also in the Spanish Netherlands, whence a cloud of missionary priests was to be sent into England, at the constant risk of their lives, to maintain the languishing fires of recusancy. A later emigration carried off the evangelic Edmund Campion, a veritable martyr, and the bustling intriguer, Robert Parson, who seems to have been, as fellow of Balliol, inclined rather to Puritanism. These were the first of a great company of English Jesuits who rivalled the diligence and self-sacrifice of the Seminary priests from Douai, but wrangled with them for precedence after a fashion that caused no little scandal. Robert Parson retained something of his former savour, for one of his books was, to his great wrath, adapted by one Edmund Bunny as "a Booke of Christian Exercise," and

published with a dedication to Edmund Sandys, when Archbishop of York.

The promulgation of the decrees of Trent, the death of the mild Pius IV, and the election of the stern Michele Ghislieri as Pius V brought matters to a head. The new Pope decided on drastic measures against Elizabeth. His emissaries, well supplied with money, stirred up active rebellion in the North of England, where a feeble imitation of the Pilgrimage of Grace was put down with wholesale slaughter, extending beyond the border into the country of the Catholic Hamiltons in Scotland.[1]

This effort was followed by the publication of the Bull *Regnans in excelsis*, excommunicating Elizabeth with all her supporters, and declaring her deprived of the kingdom. It was the last attempt to exercise a power claimed by the popes from the time of Gregory VII, which could never take effect unless by inducing internal rebellion or foreign intervention. It produced no further rebellion, and foreign intervention ended with the defeat of the Armada. The French Court flouted it by asking Elizabeth to be sponsor at the baptism of the King's daughter, and profited by it in detaching England from the Spanish alliance. The folly of it was noted at the time by Niccolò Ormaneto, the Nuncio at Madrid, a friend of Pole who knew the English people. He recorded a conversation with the Pope, who regretted too late the consequences of his rash act : the publication of the Bull had done much harm and caused the death of many Catholics ; it ought not to have been published until there was an army in England, " bearing in one hand the Keys of St. Peter and in the other the Sword of St. Paul."[2]

[1] The gentle Grindal wrote to Bullinger, " Our troops destroyed within a few days fifty castles in Scotland by means of gunpowder, and burned three hundred villages without any resistance. Scotland is now sufficiently tranquil." *Zurich Letters*, p. 225. Such are Wars of Religion.

[2] " Talchè in una mano si portessero le chiave di S. Pietro, che era la privatione, et nel'altra la spada di S. Paolo." The pope seems to have been rather confused about the use to which the sword was actually put in the case of St. Paul, but metaphors are apt to run

The repentant Pontiff perceived at least the facts of the case. The only effect of the Bull was to sharpen the sufferings of the Recusants, and to establish in the minds of the English people a permanent bitterness against the Church of Rome.

away with their authors. This curious information may be read at length in a pamphlet written by the Jesuit Father Carini, *Monsignor Niccolò Ormaneto, Veronese, Vescovo di Padova, Nunzio Apostolico alla Corte di Filippo II, Re di Spagna.*

CHAPTER VIII

THE PURITANS

I HAVE spoken disparagingly of Conformists, of those who without conviction, or against conviction, acquiesced in religious changes. But there is another aspect of their conformity which has not been ignored, and I will now return to it for a moment. Where there is no strong conviction, but only an active dislike, either of change in general or of particular changes actually made, there may be a positive virtue in acquiescence. It may be reprehensible to disturb on such grounds the peace of human society, of the State or of the Church. The change may have been made tyrannically, but even tyranny is not always to be resisted. To speak theologically, it is not permissible to make a schism out of disagreement on matters which are not essential. Attack and defence alike have to reckon with this. Inveterate abuses ought to be endured patiently, if they cannot be removed without wrecking the unity of the Church. A phrase of Thorndike's comes into my mind. Adventurous though he was in suggesting reforms, he could reflect that there are some faults which it were "more mischief to mend than to bear with." Conversely, resistance to a deplorable change has an imposed limit. It should stop short of the disruption of a social order which is worth preserving.

On these grounds we can justify the acquiescence of the clergy and people of England in the Elizabethan Reformation. It is clear that to all but a negligible minority it was unwelcome, and many of its features were a grievance. But the Church and all its institutions, from the Primacy to the parish, were worth preserving, and could be preserved only

by patient conformity. So they accepted what was done. Many of them, perhaps most of them, nursed a hope of its reversal; a hope which was certainly encouraged by the experience of recent years. The Northern Rebellion of 1569 was a reckless and ill-directed attempt to forestall that hope, and the insurgents who survived the massacre in which it ended relapsed into sullen acquiescence. The Earl of Sussex, having suppressed the movement, could report to the Queen that conformity was restored, but he warned her that he could not find ten gentlemen in Yorkshire who approved of her reformation. Conformity, however, is a habit that grows on those who practice it, and within forty years the precarious settlement of 1559 was stabilized, established by law, established also in the habits and even in the affections of a considerable part of the people.

It had enemies more dangerous than the Recusants, men who under cover of conformity worked for its destruction. They were empowered to do so from the first. The exiles who returned from Zurich and Frankfort, from Strassburg and Geneva, were committed to a Reformation which had no use for bishops, and in which there was no place for many things retained in the newly settled order. We have seen something of their judgment regarding that order. The foresight of Cecil or another was justified; it was for them a mingle-mangle, a cloaked papistry.[1] The ornaments and ceremonial of the Queen's chapel horrified them, and some part of that apparatus, at least, was prescribed for general use. But in spite of these objections some of them accepted commissions for putting the new laws into execution, and some months later were promoted to the bishoprics which they regarded as remnants of popery. It is difficult to suppose that in either case they intended honest administration.

Their sentiments are on record. Jewel was in some respects the best of them. Offered a bishopric, he wrote to Vermigli, "This burden I have positively determined to

[1] *Supra* p. 66.

shake off." Within six months he had shouldered it. He excused himself rather gallantly by explaining that the revenues of the bishops were being so reduced that " being released from royal pomp and courtly bustle, they may with greater ease and diligence employ their leisure in attending to the flock of Christ." It is fair to say that as Bishop of Salisbury he made good this protestation, but the veiled meaning of his remark is that he and his like were lending themselves to the rapacity of Elizabeth, who systematically made simoniacal raids on the endowments of the Church. Lamentable complaints of this are heard throughout the earlier part of her reign. The ornaments and vestments retained in use vexed his soul. " These are, indeed," he wrote, " the relics of the Amorites. . . . I wish that some time or other they may be taken away, and extirpated even to the lowest roots : neither my voice nor my exertions shall be wanting to effect that object." A little later he complains, " There seems to be far too much prudence, too much mystery in the management of these affairs ; and God alone knows what will be the issue. The slow-paced horses retard the chariot." The question of the crucifix becomes acute. He and Grindal are to dispute the subject with Parker and Coxe before moderators appointed by the Queen's Council. " As far as I can conjecture," he writes, " I shall not again write to you as a bishop. For matters are come to that pass, that either the crosses of silver and tin, which we have everywhere broken in pieces, must be restored, or our bishoprics relinquished." He was spared this painful alternative ; the destruction was condoned, the people whose churches had been despoiled seem to have obtained no redress. So one step forward in a further reformation was safely taken. Some months later he laments the retention of the surplice in use, and is still lamenting after six years of fruitless endeavour.[1]

Others were more impatient and less compliant. Thomas Sampson, a stalwart of King Edward's time, consulted

[1] *Zurich Letters*, pp. 40, 51, 52, 55, 68, 100, 148.

Vermigli even before his return from exile concerning the lawfulness of accepting a bishopric.[1] This he escaped, but he reconciled his conscience to the deanery of Christ Church at Oxford. His friend, Laurence Humphrey, became President of Magdalen. Here for a time they went their own way, but at the beginning of the year 1566 they were called to account by the Archbishop for various irregularities. Consulting Bullinger, they received from him a letter of advice, in which he urged them to regard as indifferent the rules imposed on them, and on no account to let themselves be driven out of the ministry for nonconformity, giving place to wolves or to ministers less qualified than themselves.[2] It was the advice which had been given to Hooper from Zurich sixteen years before.

The two friends were dismayed, and replied in sorrow, not without a spice of anger. Their letter of July, 1566, marks the exact starting point of the great Puritan movement which followed. They deny that the question is of things indifferent. " How," they ask, " can that habit be thought consistent with the simple ministry of Christ, which used to set off the theatrical pomp of the popish priesthood ? For not only (as our people wish to persuade your reverence) the square cap and gown worn in public are required, but sacred garments also are used in divine service ; the surplice, or white dress of the choir, and the cope are reintroduced." Too angry to be accurate, they tell him that he is misinformed in supposing that " the vestments (*rem vestiariam*) were not abolished at the beginning of the Reformation." for under Edward VI " in many places the Lord's Supper was celebrated purely without a surplice ; and the cope, which was then abrogated by law, is now restored by a public ordinance." This is but a beginning ; they fear what will come of it, and try, not quite ingenuously, to represent themselves as resisting innovation : " therefore we hesitate, not without reason, and endeavour *principiis obstare* . . .

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 1.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 354.

to depart from that liberty in which we have hitherto stood, we consider to be a sanctioning of slavery." They thus obscure the fact that the liberties which they had taken were a breach of the existing law. "We are no wranglers," they protest; "we have always avoided bitter contention; we seek friendly consultation; we do not give place to wolves, but being displaced by force we depart unwilling and mourning." They insist that any order prescribing vesture is inconsistent with Christian liberty; therefore all distinction of garb must be put away: "These dregs and this leaven of popery, believe us, are the seed-plot of all our dissensions: we desire its removal, overthrow, and burial in eternal oblivion, so that no traces of antichristian superstition may remain. Primacy and haughtiness have always displeased us in the papacy: will tyranny be pleasant in a free Church? Hitherto a free synod has untied the knots of controversy among Christians: why should everything be now referred to the judgment of one or another person? Where liberty of speech and voting reigns, there truth is strong and vigorous."[1]

These last words seem to be a backward glance at the Convocation of 1563, when drastic proposals for reform were carried in the Lower House by a majority of those present, and barely defeated by the proxies of absentees. The "one or another" charged with tyranny certainly means Parker, whose "primacy" is deftly compared with that of the Pope, and probably Grindal; for the Archbishop had succeeded, with many complaints of support lacking him, in removing the two Oxonians,[2] and Grindal had with some difficulty been brought to deal with the recalcitrant in the diocese of London. The latter attempted a weak compromise, requiring only the surplice in church, and out of doors a round cap in place of the obnoxious square. It was in-

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 157–163. I have taken some not unneeded liberties with Dr. Robinson's translation.

[2] Treating them in other respects with singular gentleness. Strype, *Parker*, pp. 185–7.

effectual, and Parker brought his suffragan into line. Other bishops, and notably Pilkington of Durham, would do nothing.

It is easy to make a mock alike of these scruples and of the halting severity with which they were suppressed. It was not unreasonable to insist on conformity, but to lay special stress on these trivialities, and conversely to endure expulsion from the sacred ministry rather than wear a square cap or a surplice, seems to be a bottomless absurdity. There are few to-day who would not agree with Bullinger. So to judge the dispute, however, is to overlook its meaning. Conformity was refused on the ground of a principle honoured at Zurich but much more strenuously maintained at Geneva; the principle that no ritual observances may be imposed by ecclesiastical authority but such as are expressly indicated by the letter of the books of the New Testament. Other observances might be tolerated, if harmless in themselves, but any attempt to enforce them must be resisted. To abandon that principle was to falsify the whole course of the Helvetic Reformation; to ardent spirits Bullinger's temporizing advice seemed nothing short of betrayal. Subsidiary considerations of policy stiffened the resistance. Zurich, after thirty years of settled reformation, could afford to be contemptuously regardless of cap and vesture; but here in England they were hardly escaped from Babylonian captivity. Men had seen the Marian persecutors wearing the square cap and surplice as their service uniform; how could preachers of the Gospel bear to resemble them? How could the vulgar and the simple distinguish between ministers so different, if this conspicuous garb were the mark of both alike? Parker and Grindal, Sandys and Jewel, walked abroad and sat in Convocation or Parliament, dressed exactly as Bonner had been. Was this tolerable? Would not men take them to be of the same vocation? Such things could not be wholly indifferent. So cap and surplice came to be the badge of conformity, and retained that character for a century or more.

We are not to suppose that men like Sampson and Humphrey halted here at the threshold. To refuse to wear the badge was an instant necessity, something which they themselves could do at once. There was much more of the same sort, more dregs of popery, not all of which they could individually cast off. Their letter to Bullinger had an appendix, containing " some straws and chips of the popish religion " which still littered the imperfectly reformed Church of England. There are thirteen articles. In addition to the disputed vestments, there is some show of popery in divine worship ; in the ministration of the Supper an unleavened cake is substituted for common bread, and the communicants are required to kneel ; part-singing[1] is allowed and organs are coming in ; women are permitted to baptize in private houses ; the popish ritual of the ring is used in marriage ; women still come veiled for their purification. Ministers of the Church are not allowed by law to marry, and their children are by some accounted as bastards. Discipline there is none ; but there are many vestiges of the antichristian Church ; as formerly at Rome, so here in the court of the Metropolitan, all is venal ; pluralities, dispensations for non-residence, for eating flesh on fasts, and for marriage during Lent, are all on sale ; ministers of Christ are not free to preach, are required to declare their assent to all the ceremonies in use, and forbidden to advocate any kind of innovation. " Lastly, the article about spiritual manducation printed in the time of Edward VI, which in set terms oppugned and eliminated any real presence in the eucharist, and contained a plain statement of the truth, is now mutilated and truncated for circulation among us."

This may stand as a programme of the Puritan movement, which kept close to the lines here laid down. The discipline which is wholly lacking means that of the Reformed in general, whether leaning to Zurich or to Geneva ; we shall presently be considering a local attempt

[1] " Musicæ sonos fractos et exquisitissimos." I am not sure whether I have rightly interpreted this.

to establish it. The complaint of abuses in the ecclesiastical courts was well founded, and ultimately became the chief weapon in the Puritan armoury. And let it be observed that this title of Puritan properly refers to the accepted task of purifying the Church from the defilements here enumerated, and not to the austere morality that its bearers affected and to a large extent realized. They were not responsible for the prominence given to unimportant details of costume; it was Parker who selected these for a trial of strength. But this selection being made, wisely or unwisely, an issue of great importance was at once raised. The Puritans denied the right of the Church to make rules affecting the conduct of its ministers or the manner of its worship. Nothing might be effectively ordered but what was explicitly mentioned in the text of Scripture or demonstrably inferred therefrom. Canons or rubrics going beyond this must be reckoned, at the most, as suggestions, good, bad, or indifferent, which were on no account to be treated as obligatory. On this they insisted. They did not as yet challenge the pastoral authority of the bishops, and so far they fell short of the pure standard of Zurich, but they were disposed to treat them as officers of the Crown, and so brought them within the rule that the affairs of the Church other than the Word and the Sacraments are controlled by the magistracy. They had powerful friends at Court, Cecil and Leicester among the chief, and did not doubt that with patience they would be able to complete the work of reformation. The enforcement of a prescribed attire was a shattering blow to their hopes.

There is little evidence of any popular reaction to their sorrows. The dispute was probably too academic for anything of the kind. When we hear of the square cap being mocked in the streets of London, and of conformists being hustled by rude crowds, we may suppose that an excuse for ribaldry was seized without much interest in the cause. To see a beloved pastor shut out from his church was another matter, and there certainly were such incidents. One story

is told of a private conventicle opened for the dispossessed, but the time for that form of relief was not yet come, and the strictest Puritans objected. Elsewhere than in London, or where Parker's hand was felt, there seems to have been so little pressure put upon nonconformists that resistance was hardly noticeable. Most of the bishops were more or less secretly sympathetic. In a large collection of episcopal visitation articles and injunctions, dating from 1564 to 1575, I find only Parker himself, Grindal at York, Coxe at Ely, Guest at Rochester and Cooper at Lincoln demanding the use of the surplice.[1] Another irregularity is even more striking. A rubric in the Prayer-book expressly required a celebration of the Holy Communion in all cathedrals " every Sunday at the least, except they have reasonable cause to the contrary." In the same collection I find Horn alone enjoining this at Winchester ; Parker at Canterbury, Jewel at Salisbury, Grindal at York, require it once a month ; Guest at Rochester " every three weeks once," Barnes at Carlisle " at least eight times in the year."[2] No reasonable causes for this reduction are mentioned. If such laxity was encouraged in cathedrals, it is needless to ask what degree of conformity was exacted in parish churches. But something very different from protesting about caps and clothes would be needed for rousing the interest of the people and pushing forward a fair copy of the Helvetic Reformation.

Experiments were made, one of which is known in full detail and deserves examination. Among the bishops first promoted after the accession of Elizabeth was Edmund Scambler, of whom little is known except that he was not a returned exile, but had courageously served a private conventicle throughout Mary's reign.[3] In the year 1571 we find him taking part in a root and branch reformation of his diocese of Peterborough. Among the State papers of

[1] Frere, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions* (Alcuin Club Collections), Vol. III, pp. 140, 295, 298, 234, 370.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 79, 94, 116, 135, 152, 339.

[3] So Burnet, *Hist.*, Part II, p. 339 (Pocock's ed., Vol. II, p. 543) without authority cited.

that year is a document containing Orders for Religious Worship in the town of Northampton, put out by "the Mayor of the Town and his Brethren, and other the Queen's Majesty's Justice of the Peace within the County and Town," with the consent of the Bishop.[1] Some particulars may be extracted.

"The singing and playing of Organs, beforetime accustomed in the Quire" is forbidden, the Common Prayer "according to the Queen's Book," being read in the body of the church, with "singing psalms," that is to say, the metrical version, before and after the sermon. At the chief church of the town there is a sermon every Sunday after Morning Prayer, to which the worshippers in other churches are bidden repair, their own service being ended for that reason by nine o'clock. After Evening Prayer, the young people are examined, their elders also being present, in "a portion of Calvin's Catechism." During the time of sermon or catechism it is forbidden "under such penalties as shall be appointed," to sit in the streets or to walk abroad. There is a general Communion once a quarter in every parish church. A fortnight before the appointed day, "the Minister with the churchwardens maketh a circuit from house to house, to take the names of the communicants, and to examine the state of their lives. Among whom, if any discord be found, the parties are brought before the Mayor and his brethren, being assisted by the Preacher and other gentlemen. Before whom there is reconcilement made, or else correction, or putting the party from the Communion, which will not live in charity." Immediately after the Communion the minister "returneth to every house, to understand who have not received the Communion according to the common order taken, and certifieth it to the Mayor, etc., who with the Minister examineth the matter, and useth means of persuasion to induce them to their duties." On every appointed day, "each parish hath two

[1] S. P. Dom, Vol. LXXVIII, No. 38. Strype, *Ann.*, Vol. II, p. 90. I am relying on Strype's text.

Communions ; the one for servants and officers to begin at five of the clock in the morning, with a sermon of an hour, and to end at eight ; the other for masters and dames, etc., to begin at nine the same day, with like sermon, and to end at twelve."

This scheme, apart from the use of Calvin's Catechism, is pure Zurich. The Bishop practically abdicates, links himself as a public official with the Mayor and the Justices, and transfers to them the whole government of the Church. They set up precisely that " discipline," the lack of which was deplored by Sampson and Humphrey, entirely ignoring the Archdeacon and the diocesan Chancellor, whose functions they usurp. It is impossible to say what success was achieved, or what other experiments of the same kind were made ; but it is known that the " prophesyings " and " exercises " which accompanied the scheme flourished exceedingly for many years. These, however, did not supersede the regular administration of the Church, but were rather supplementary. The Northampton model would have superseded everything else, supplying the erstwhile exiles with a Church of that pattern which they remembered with affection, and affected with unceasing desire. It is perhaps significant that the searchers who ransacked the diocesan registers for material on which the Ritual Commission of 1868 might work found no example of an archidiaconal visitation in the reign of Elizabeth earlier than the year 1599. Afterwards they become frequent.[1] At this earlier date it was not impossible that all the English prelates would become as completely secularized as certain bishops in the Lutheran parts of Germany, or as the commendatories of bishoprics and abbacies in Scotland.

Even more adventurous was the policy advocated by Thomas Cartwright. This was at the beginning purely academical. We have observed that from the first the Reformation took root in the University of Cambridge, nor was it entirely eradicated by the drastic measures of Mary's

[1] See Appendix E to the Commissioners' Report, p. 400 seqq.

reign. It is evident that secret sympathizers were fairly numerous there before Elizabeth's legislation released them from restraint, and they were active in the futile battle of the vestures. In 1569 Cartwright, a fellow of Trinity, began a more definite agitation, based not on Zurich, but on Geneva. Zurich was settling on the lees ; Calvinism, now led by Beza, was more militant than ever in France and beyond, laying hold of the Netherlands and well established in Scotland, from which countries it could flow easily into England. Cartwright took it up in its full development, insisting on a precise form of doctrine, a precise order in the Church, having for a clear-cut principle " equality of ministers," and tolerating no form of prelacy. Making interest with the younger graduates, he secured the elective Lady Margaret Professorship, and from that commanding position launched an attack on the whole constitution of the Church. Whitgift, as Vice-Chancellor, took steps to silence him. An appeal to Cecil, the Chancellor, was fruitless, for the Queen's secretary, though personally sympathetic, could not openly countenance an onslaught on the established order. Cartwright was expelled from the University, and in 1571 visited Geneva, whence he returned in the following year, strengthened by Beza's not impartial recognition of him as the most learned man of the time. He found the country buzzing with the secretly printed " Admonition to Parliament," which called for the legal establishment of the Genevan discipline under " Pastors, Doctors, Elders and Deacons." It had an amazing success, running through four editions within eighteen months. At last the popular ear seemed to have been caught by a demand for the completion of the Reformation. Whitgift's criticism of it drew the " Second Admonition," written by Cartwright himself. A warrant being out for his arrest, he fled to Heidelberg, where Calvinism was now supreme ; thence to Middelburg in the Netherlands, where he took charge of a congregation of exiles like himself and directed thence the movement in England. His preface to Travers'

Disciplina Ecclesiastica was the immediate occasion calling forth Hooker's great work on the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity.

This appeal to Parliament was entirely inconsistent with Calvin's fundamental principle of the independence of the Church, and marks the difficulty which Englishmen have always had in grasping that principle, or at all events in applying it. Cartwright and Travers could at once assert it vehemently and act in the contrary sense ; they were moved by the English instinct for practical politics. Hooker was to contradict their assertion without making profit of their own contradictory action. This, no doubt, seemed to him so natural as to call for no remark. In the parliamentary session of 1576 a vigorous attempt was made to act on the Admonition, a foretaste of the Parliament of 1640, and this might have been successful but for the stubborn resistance of Elizabeth, who saw in it an attack on her prerogative. Later attempts failed in the same way. When Whitgift became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1583, after seven years of Grindal's feeble administration, the bishops began to set their house in order by proper canonical process, and to remove some of the gross abuses which fed the Puritan agitation ; but they also failed in great measure through the Queen's jealousy of all independent action.

More in accordance with Calvinist principles was an obscure endeavour to set up what was sometimes called "presbytery within episcopacy," a system of voluntary associations not unlike the Northampton model described above. It was but a sham, a colourable imitation of true Presbyterianism, which was incompatible with the parochial system and the legal rights of patrons. Robert Browne was the first to see the futility of this. An able man of unstable character, he seized the true meaning of the "Gathered Church" in Calvin's theology.[1] Joining the exiles at Middelburg, and quarrelling with them after the manner of exiles, he issued thence in the year 1582 a "Treatise of

[1] *Supra*, pp. 23, 32.

Reformation without Tarrying for any," showing the way to constitute such a church. This was the beginning of Independency. The Gathered Church was to know no superior but the Lord Christ. It would not acknowledge the supremacy of the Crown, for it was independent of King or Commonwealth. But to refuse acknowledgment of the royal supremacy, when called upon to do so, was to incur the penalties of treason. Puritans thus began in 1583 to have their own martyrs, and it is worthy of note that the charge against the first of them, Copping and Thacker, was that " the prisoners, instead of acknowledging her majesty's supremacy in all causes, would allow it only in civil."[1] Thus they suffered under a statute expressly directed against Recusants, and it was not forgotten by disingenuous opponents that they agreed with papists. Subsequent legislation subjected the Independents to the milder charge of felony, giving them the choice of death or banishment. Barrow and Greenwood and Penry suffered in 1593; a considerable number abjured the realm and took refuge in Holland. Thence they carried their principles and their developed organization to the shores of Massachusetts, where the Gathered Church dominated as from without the ordering of the State. In England they throve on intermittent persecution, but became engaged in controversy chiefly with the Presbyterians, over the question of the hierarchy of pastor, doctor, elder and deacon. It is important, however, to remember that there were Puritans who were neither Presbyterian nor Independent, of whom Baxter was a notable example. There were conformists also who agreed with them in principle, and were eager to accept any approximation to their practice which might be allowed by law.

The established order, weakened by grave abuses, had little hold on the affections of the people. This was further diminished when many of the bishops and clergy, under the influence of a refined humanism, fell away from the strict

[1] Neal, vol. 1, p. 260.

Augustinian theology which had formerly been dominant. I must repeat my warning against the identification of this theology with Calvinism. Whitgift, the hammerer of Calvinists, tried to impose it on the clergy as digested in the nine "Lambeth Articles," and English prelates concurred with little hesitation in the condemnation of Arminius at the Synod of Dort. From that time onward the charge of Arminianism was alleged against Laud and his school, exactly as the Jesuits were accused of Pelagianism by militant Jansenists; and the charge was damaging. The unpopularity of Laud thus worked in favour of the Puritans, both doctrinally and in respect of administration. It drove them to common action in spite of their intestine controversies.

They were, however, fatally divided, and fell apart as soon as the common enemy was overthrown. The Presbyterians had their brief triumph in the Long Parliament. Calling the Scots in aid, they bound themselves by the Solemn League and Covenant to set up an intolerant system in the two kingdoms. The Independents, with Cromwell for leader, broke up the Covenant, and by the power of the sword put down impartially both episcopacy and presbytery. The Presbyterians called back the King from exile, to deliver them from the tyranny of the Army and the Sectaries. They found to their dismay that with the King the bishops also returned. Thenceforward the utmost that the Puritans could hope for was toleration, the toleration which in their day of power they had denied to all others. The Christianity of England was left sharply divided, and so it continues.

CHAPTER IX

THE CONFORMISTS

RECUSANTS were vocal; Puritans were vociferous; what of the dumb multitude? Of Conformists I have spoken both ill and well, in relation to the supposed motive of their conformity; it remains to ascertain, if possible, its consequences.

For the best part of a century it must have been fairly general. Nonconformity, whether passive or active, was subject to repressive penalties. The fine of twelve pence for abstention from divine worship would be sufficient, if regularly inflicted, to secure the ordinary attendance of all who were not deterred by a grave conscientious objection; and, being collected by the churchwardens in aid of the parochial funds which they administered, it was probably not often allowed to go by default. England was, for the most part, a land of small rural parishes, in which it was impossible to evade observation; the few large towns were, with rare exceptions, minutely divided into parishes in which every man's coming or going was open to close inspection. The details of the Northampton Model, described above, show how effective the supervision could be made. There can be no doubt that habitual churchgoing was in this way secured. So far the Church "established by law" held the common people. The inhabitants of rural parishes, from squire to labourer, were as a rule passive conformists, nor is there any reason for supposing a different state of things in cities and market towns. We must except, in certain regions, a rather large minority of Recusants, tending for some years to increase, a very small minority of persecuted sectaries, the "Family of Love" or groups of

Anabaptists, and in later years a growing minority of Independents belonging to Gathered Churches.

In respect of active conformity, the due performance of the prescript order of worship, the common people lay at the mercy of the local authorities. Here again the Northampton Model is valuable evidence. So long as bishops and archdeacons were slack, or even faithless, in requiring adhesion to the prescript form, individual worshippers were helpless ; they were herded into the parish church to endure the vagaries of the minister. It is not to be supposed that many of them were interested in the vestiarian controversy, and aggrieved at the sight or the absence of a surplice and square cap, or at the appearance of the parson in the falling cape of Genevan fashion tolerated by Grindal in place of the priest's gown. They probably grumbled about such things, like their descendants of to-day, but they had not the modern privilege of turning their backs on them and going elsewhere or nowhere. When a stricter requirement of the prescript order began with the primacy of Whitgift, to continue with growing stringency till the meeting of the Long Parliament, there was still no small measure of nonconformity in detail, as well as a more general approach to Puritan standards. It was not difficult so to manipulate the Prayer-book as to produce a colorable imitation of the Genevan worship. Some ardent Conformists took advantage of this when the Prayer-book itself was proscribed by an ordinance of the Parliament ; Robert Sanderson, for example, recited from memory such parts of it as might not dangerously awake the suspicion of spies and informers. The less accommodating Thorndike thought this an unworthy compliance ;[1] but such assimilation seems to have been popular, and it continued in some measure after the Restoration, when many Puritans, become Conformists, introduced into the practice of the Church their own practice of delivering two sermons every Lord's Day, and of

[1] See his letter in Haddan's edition of his *Theological Works*, Vol. VI, pp.116–119.

treating the sermon as the culminating act of worship.

This was the most conspicuous mark left by the Reformation upon the Church of England, as regards the religion of the people. It was made possible by the operation of a rubric in the Elizabethan Prayer-book, prescribing that "there shall be no celebration of the Lord's Supper except there be a good number to communicate with the priest, according to his discretion." In some editions there was an unauthorized alteration of the words "a good number" into "a great number." The practice of the Reformed was to require all possible communicants, unless reasonably hindered, to receive on every occasion, and on this account Calvin found himself compelled, much against his will, to be content with a monthly celebration at Geneva. Elsewhere it was much less frequent, and indeed it was usually made an annual event. The responsibility for this rests on the Catholic laity of the time, who rarely communicated except at Easter, and thought more frequent participation an unwarrantable presumption.[1] The western insurgents of 1549, we may remember, demanded that it should not be allowed.

The English rubric fell far short of the rule of the Reformed, and Cartwright on that account denounced it.[2] But it was effective as a restraint on frequency. A further rubric set a standard for determining what is "a good number." In a parish containing as few as twenty possible communicants, there must be "four, or three at the least," to communicate with the priest. This proportion, or something like it, was pressed in the injunctions of bishops who sympathized with the Reformed. Parkhurst, for example, forbade celebration without the rubrical number in smaller parishes and "in greater parishes without a greater number."[3]

Under Puritan control, as at Northampton, the rule of

[1] See Dalgairns, *The Holy Communion*, 2nd Ed., p. 236.
[2] See Keble's *Hooker*, Vol. II, p. 375. *notes*.
[3] *Visitation Articles* (Alcuin Club Collection), Vol. III, p. 103.

the Reformed was imposed in its integrity. The effect of the rubric is seen in the conviction of George Herbert that a celebration " five or six times in the year " was the utmost that could be achieved.[1] There was left, if all the rubrics were carefully observed, that strange form of worship, neither Catholic nor Reformed, which survived in many places to our own day, a truncated service, a " dry mass," which barely indicated what had been lost. Where Puritan ideals controlled a partial and grudging conformity, where there was no permanent Holy Table, but only a trestle-board set out when required, when the " table-prayers " were unceremoniously recited in a reading-pew and all that followed the sermon or homily was omitted, any semblance of the old Catholic service was lost. A true " mingle-mangle " ensued to provoke the derision of consistent Puritans, who met with fiercer resentment the endeavours of the Laudian clergy to revive observance of the maimed rubrical order. It is not surprising that in the long run, when compulsion ceased, Englishmen ceased on the whole to be a worshipping people. Yet we do well to remember that out of that maimed order issued Keble's " Christian Year."[2]

The discipline of the Christian life was represented to the common man chiefly by the procedure of the Archdeacon's or the Bishop's Court, beginning with delation or inquisition under the oath *ex officio ;* in the forefront was penance, derisory or commuted for money ; in the background, excommunication and the sheriff's jail. The Recusant saw the Church established by law as " reformed " and therefore damnable. The Puritan knew it better as unreformed ; it was the authentic Church of sumnour and pardoner, of the abuses at which Piers Plowman raged and Chaucer mocked. The common man detested the whole business. When Laud's harsh righteousness applied the procedure to the

[1] Herbert, *The Country Parson*, Chap. xxii.

[2] Note in particular the opening words of the poem for Ash Wednesday.

wealthy and the noble, both it and he were doomed. A bishop made an attempt to amend it in Parliament,[1] but he was too late ; Milton's " two-handed engine " was poised to strike. The procedure returned with the Restoration, to linger ineffective but vexatious into the nineteenth century. When Puritans complained of the lack of discipline, they were rightly desiring something more effective and more pastoral.

There is little evidence by which to measure the value of the pastoral care to which the common people were in fact committed. Our investigations have revealed a low standard of clerical living, and no improvement is discernible. Records exist of multitudinous ordinations of scandalously unqualified men by Elizabethan bishops. The complaints of Puritans must be accepted with reserve, but it may well be that they were themselves, in their aggressive temper, the more efficient pastors of the time. There were known exceptions. The noted Bernard Gilpin was boldly claimed by Neal as himself a Puritan ; the story of his life, written by his kinsman, the Bishop of Chichester, puts him in a different light.[2] In this brief record we see him first a student at Queen's College, Oxford, chosen by Henry VIII to serve in his new foundation of Christ Church ; then disputing publicly against John Hooper, the prospective Reformer, and later against " Peter Martir," who moved him to doubt whether the Papacy were not indeed the predicted Antichrist. After this he goes abroad to study at Louvain and Paris, being offered by Tunstall a benefice with cure of souls for his maintenance. This he declines, as a burden on his conscience, offending the good bishop. At Paris he put through the press his patron's book, " concerning the truth of the body and blood of Christ our Lord in the Eucharist," and was rewarded by collation to the rectory of Easington, with the archdeaconry of Durham

[1] See the Bishop of Lincoln's Bill, printed in my *Herbert Thorndike*, Appendix II, p. 146.

[2] Neal, *History of the Puritans*, Vol. I, p. 262. Carleton, *The Life of Bernard Gilpin*, London, 1639, pp. 60.

attached. Here he was engaged in some perilous discussion, which led to an accusation of heresy, but the Bishop stood by him, and preferred him to the vast parish of Houghton-le-Spring. Here and in remote regions on the Border he laboured until his death in 1583, the most satisfactory example known to us of the Conformist surviving three revolutions. He refused the bishopric of Carlisle, offered him by Elizabeth with the significant promise that the revenues of the See should not be raided on his acceptance. He lived among his own people, displaying every kind of pastoral activity. But in reading the story one observes how personal and individual it all was. The work was his own, the methods were his own. There is no evidence of any system which inspired them, or into which they fitted.

This will be observed also in the life of an equally remarkable man, who followed him just a century later. Richard Baxter was, I have said, a Puritan with a difference. He disliked Presbyterians and thought still worse of Independents, though he was ultimately driven into the discomfort of alliance with both. Bred a Conformist, he was ordained deacon with every intention of so continuing ; but scruples about some details of the Prayer-book hindered him, at least for a time, from proceeding to the priesthood, and after the Restoration prevented his appointment to a bishopric. They did not, however, prevent him from working as preacher, under the bishop's licence, in his part of Worcestershire. His later adventures—it is the right word—at Kidderminster show his mettle. When the Civil War had broken the established order in pieces, he accepted an invitation from some two hundred of the inhabitants—including the Bailiff—to serve as pastor. Adhering firmly to the parochial system, intolerant of sectaries and having no use for a Gathered Church, he took charge as by full right, doubting not that it was given him by God, and administered all things according to his own judgment, a Calvin in miniature. Sometimes tyrannical, as when he

refused to communicate Sir Ralph Clare kneeling,[1] conspicuously generous to the sequestrated Vicar, always devoted, he could say with truth after thirteen years that he had laboured most abundantly. He has been ridiculed for submitting to the Savoy Conference a complete liturgy, composed by himself in a bare fortnight, but this was in truth a description of his own practice, formed in the course of those strenuous years. In addition he created the county Association of Ministers, directing it as if he were indeed a diocesan bishop. He did all this with shattered health, and with no force behind him but that of his own character.[2]

These two men illustrate the saying that the English are a race of amateurs. They fitted into the time. The impact of the Reformation, without reforming the Church of England, had reduced it for the time being to confusion, giving scope for personal action. Such was also the fragrant life of strict conformity at Little Gidding. It is probable that most of the spiritual religion of the time was of that nature. Let us glance at one other remarkable man, though he belongs chiefly to the period of reconstruction.

John Bunyan, the Bunyan of "Grace Abounding," was bred in the tradition of parochial conformity. It may be strange to think of this pastor of a Gathered Church, this prisoner for conscience sake, as a Conformist. But he was a man of strange exceptions, and his own children were baptized at the parish font. His earliest reading was in the "high church" *Practice of Piety*, written by Lewis Bayly, the Bishop of Bangor, which rivalled his own masterpiece in wide circulation. There is a comic touch in his story of the dismay with which he learnt that he had been quoting as Scripture a text from Ecclesiasticus. He

[1] At the Savoy Conference he was reduced to pleading that the posture should be treated as indifferent.

[2] I must acknowledge my indebtedness to Dr. F. J. Powicke's two illuminating volumes on the life of Richard Baxter. But the autobiography of the *Reliquiae* should be read, with tolerance of its simple-hearted egoism.

had probably heard it read in the course of divine worship. My point is that this man of genius, this tinker or blacksmith, had to be converted from the formalism of conformity, which thereafter seemed to him a sink of iniquity, and to fashion his own religion. And with what result? Sectarian commonplaces? Yes; but read about the House of the Interpreter, follow the Pilgrim to the Cross, rest in the House Beautiful, hear the children being catechized; note the prescription of that "ancient and well-approved physician," Mr Skill, the potion "made *ex carne et sanguine Christi*"—"you know physicians give strange medicines to their patients"—to be taken "fasting, in half a quarter of a pint of tears of repentance." What is this religion? Calvinist or Catholic? The answer is that it is English, insular; and yet it has gone the round of the world.

EPILOGUE

I RECKON the formative period of the Reformation to end in France with the Edict of Nantes, in Germany with the Treaties of Westphalia, in England with the Restoration. In each case the end came with exhaustion following wars of religion. It was tragical failure. For we must acknowledge that the object of the movement in all its forms was reformation of the Christian Church as a whole. I reckon Calvinism the most perfect form, the result of a consistent adhesion to the first principles of the movement, and English Independency or Congregationalism the last word of Calvinism. Lutheranism and the Helvetic Reformation soon became static and locally particular. Calvinism has all but perished in France, its true native seat ; elsewhere it remains vigorous. Congregationalism seems to be the only organization of the Reformed—I avoid the term Protestant—which has any vitality or adaptiveness, and many offshoots of the Reformation, which are not historically connected with it, tend to assimilation. It has a genuine popular appeal. A fundamental independence of communities lends itself readily to methods of federation, and federation seems to be the only way in which the Christianity of the Reformed can make any approach to unity. Federation is not unity, and is therefore in contrast with Catholicity. But the aim of the Reformation was the amendment of the whole Catholic Church. The objective has been missed ; mainly, I think, through a wilful breaking away from history. Therefore the Reformation has been a tragic failure.

The epilogue of the tragedy is an unconquerable hope that the Reformed will not achieve that kind of unification which they desire, but will rather disintegrate, and eventually find

their way by sections into the fold of Catholicity. They will find there much for which they have laboured; indeed, much which has been learned from them. They will find the conception of the Gathered Church, completely distinct from every other form of human society, and completely independent. The Counter-Reformation known to history was in fact a product of the Reformation. But before this hope can come to fruition, those sections of Christendom which know that Catholicity is of the essence of the Church must put aside their mutual jealousies and their meaningless disputes, that arms may be opened wide to welcome all believers in the Lord Christ.

INDEX

Albrecht of Brandenburg, 2
Admonition to Parliament, The, 104, 105
Adrian VI, 4
Allen, Cardinal, 90
Anabaptists, 5, 8, 39, 109
Apostasy, Meaning of, 78
Arminianism, 107
Articles, The Thirty-nine, 77
Arundel, 41

Baius, 22
Barlow, William, 49, 51, 70–2
Barnes, 43, 47
Barrow, 106
Basel, 4, 7, 10, 17
Baxter, 106, 113
Beza, 15, 29, 31, 104
Bilney, 42, 46
Bocher, Joan, 53
Bonivard, 21
Bonner, 49, 50, 70, 79, 89
Bourbon, Antoine de, 30
Bradford, 53, 59
Browne, Robert, 105
Bucer, 7, 58
Bullinger, 7, 11, 96
Bundschuh, The, 3
Bunyan, 114

Campion, 90
Cartwright, 103
Catechism, The Genevan, 22, 77, 102
Catherine de' Medici, 16, 30, 89
Cecil, 66, 72, 89, 100
Chantries, Suppression of, 55
Charles V, 4, 35
Christianization, 34
Church and State, Distinction of, 27, 32–3, 63
Clement VII, 4, 16
Communion, Frequency of, 101–2, 110
Confessio Helvetica, The, 11–13, 77
Consistory, The Genevan, 27
Constance, 4, 15
Cop, Nicholas, 17
Courts, Ecclesiastical, 111
Coverdale, 37
Coxe, 67, 80
Cranmer, 37, 42, 45, 50–1
Cromwell, Thomas, 36, 44
Cyprian, The episcopate of, 33

Dort, Synod of, 107
Douai, College of, 90

Election of Bishops, 71
Erasmus, 7, 13, 42
Establishment, Meaning of, 61–2
Eugenius IV, 4
Excommunicato capiendo, De, 61, 111
Exiles, Conduct of, 58, 105

Faber Stapulensis, 16
Farel, 16, 19
Ferdinand I, 6, 9, 37
Fisher, 38, 69
Forest Cantons, The, 9
Foxe, John, 39–41
Francis I, 16
Frankfort, Exiles at, 58
Freiburg, 7
Frith, 42

GARDINER, 44, 50
Gathered Church, The, 23, 33, 105, 117
Geneva, 10, 20, 26–7
Gilpin, Bernard, 112

Hæretico comburendo, De, 38, 61
Heath, 50, 66
Heresy, Limitation of, 63
Hermann of Wied, 2
Hierarchies, The two, 77
Hodgekyn, 49, 72
Hooker, 62, 74, 105
Hooper, 52–3, 58, 112
Huguenots, 20, 28
Humphrey, Laurence, 96

INDEPENDENTS, The, 106–7
Institutio, Calvin's, 13, 14, 18, 23
Invisible Church, The, 8, 11, 22
Ius reformandi, 1

JANSENIUS, 22
Jewel, 73, 78, 81, 84, 94
John XXII, 18, 38
Julius II, 5, 6
— III, 88

KAPPEL, Battle of, 10
— Treaty of, 9
Keble, 111
Kitchen, Anthony, 49, 71–2
Knox, John, 33

Lambeth Articles, The, 107
La Rochelle, 27
Latimer, 43, 53
Land, 107, 111
Lausanne, 7, 21
Laynez, 31
Lessius, 22
Lever, Thomas, 82
Lewis of Bavaria, 36
Little Gidding, 114
Lollards, The, 39–41, 45
Long Parliament, The, 105, 109

MACHYN, Henry, 59
Magistrate, The Civil, 12
Marburg, The Conference of, 7
Margaret of Navarre, 17, 24, 30
Marignano, Battle of, 5
Marot, Clément, 30
Marriage of Clergy, 54–5
Marsiglio, 36
Martin V, 4
Mary of Scotland, 31, 64, 69, 83–5
Melville, Andrew, 33
Molina, 22
More, Thomas, 38, 45
Münster, 5
Münzer, 3

NANTES, Edict of, 32, 116
Northampton Model, The, 102, 108
Northern Rebellion, The, 91, 94
Northumberland, Duke of, 48, 51, 58

OATH of Supremacy, The, 70, 79, 85, 90
Ockham, 38
Ordonnances ecclésiastiques, The, 27
Osnabrück, Bishop of, 2

PARIS, Parlement of, 16
Parker, Matthew, 67, 70, 76, 89
— — Consecration of, 72–3
Parson, Robert, 90
Paul III, 2, 35, 87
— IV, 87, 88
Peasant Revolt, The, 3
Penal Laws, The, 86
Penry, 106
Peter Martyr, 112. *See* Vermigli
Philip II, 37, 54, 64–6, 88
— of Hessen, 7
Pilgrimage of Grace, The, 37
Pius IV, 88
— V, 91
Poissy, The Colloquy of, 31
Pole, Cardinal, 65, 71, 87
Politiques, The, 32
Pollard, Professor A. F., 4, 57
Ponet, 52
Predestinarianism, 22

Protest of Speier, The, 4
Psychopannychia, Calvin's, 18
Puritan, meaning of the term, 100
— programme, The, 99
Reformationsgewalt, 1, 4
Regnans in excelsis, the Bull, 91
Respublica Christiana, The, 27, 32
Revolutions, The three, 48
Ridley, 49, 52–3
Rogers, 53, 59
Roussel, Gérard, 24

Sampson, Thomas, 82, 95
Schinner, Cardinal, 5
Schmalkaldic League, The, 5, 44-
Six Articles, The, 44–6, 50, 56, 65
Societas Perfecta, 32
Sohm, Rudolph, 1
Solemn League and Covenant, The, 107
Somerset, Duke of, 50, 57
Speier, Diet of, 4
Strassburg, 7, 21, 58
Supreme Head, the title of, 36, 52, 65, 68

Thirlby, 51
Thorndike, 93, 109, 112
Travers, 105
Trent, Council of, 13, 88, 91
Tunstall, 41, 43, 50, 68, 71
Tyndale, 37, 42, 44

Uniformity, The Act of, 68

Vaud, Pays de, 7
Verbal Treason, 86
Vermigli, 11, 54, 58, 73, 74, 80
Vestiarian Controversy, The, 96–101

Waldmann, Hans, 6
Western Insurrection, The, 56, 110
Weston, 52
Westphalia, The Treaties of, 1, 2, 5, 116
Whitgift, 74, 104–5, 107
Wolsey, 37, 42
Worms, Diet of, 3
Wyclif, 38

Zurich, 6–11, 62, 68, 98, 104
Zwingli, 5–10

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
THE BOWERING PRESS, PLYMOUTH

87957
283.04S
L116
Lacey, T.A.
The reformation and the

283.04 S
L 116
87957